

UC-NRLF



B 3 145 888

University of California



Lux ex Tenebris.



Claus Spreckels Fund.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation





Wm: White

"MAKERS OF AMERICA"

THE
LIFE AND TIMES
OF
BISHOP WHITE

BY
JULIUS H. WARD



NEW YORK
DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY

1892

BX 5995
W 5 W 3

Copyright, 1892,
BY DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY.

All rights reserved.

SPRECKELS

University Press:
JOHN WILSON AND SON, CAMBRIDGE.

TO

JOHN WILLIAMS,

Presiding Bishop in the Chair of Seabury,

This Biography

OF

THE PATRIARCH OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH

IS DEDICATED

BY ONE OF HIS SPIRITUAL SONS.

101850

P R E F A C E.

THE career of BISHOP WHITE involves the history of the first half century of the American Episcopal Church. He was its first Bishop in the English line, and to him for fifty years fell the duty of guiding its growth and presiding over its councils. When he died in 1836, he was so well known that it was not thought necessary to write a biography in detail, and Dr. Wilson's Memoir is the only attempt that has been made to set forth his individual career. Bishop Perry has rendered invaluable service in gathering up and putting into print the documentary ecclesiastical history of the period; but, so far as I know, this is the first attempt that has been made to give a personal portrait of this great Church leader, and to show what part he had in the civil and religious life of the times in which he lived.

Bishop White was not a voluminous letter-writer, and most of his contemporaries passed away without putting on paper their impressions of him, so that the painting of his portrait has

not been an easy task. Had it not been for the excellent memory of his great-granddaughter, Mrs. Elizabeth White Reed, the widow of the lamented Prof. Henry Reed, and for the comprehensive knowledge of the Bishop's life and times possessed by his great-grandson, Mr. Thomas H. Montgomery, this work would have greatly lacked in such colour and in such accuracy of detail as it has. The materials have been gathered from free access to Bishop White's manuscripts, from Dr. Bird Wilson's "Memoir," from his own very full "Memoirs of the Church," and from the biographies of his later contemporaries.

There are three notable portraits of Bishop White, — the one by Gilbert Stuart, painted when he was first consecrated to the Episcopate; the one which has been engraved by John Sartain, and represents him as the Chaplain of the Continental Congress; and the one made by Inman in his extreme old age, which has been chosen for reproduction, because it best presents him in his official character.

J. H. W.

BROOKLINE, Mass.

Sept. 2, 1892.

CONTENTS.



CHAPTER	PAGE
Introduction by Bishop Potter	v
I. Early Life	11
II. In Holy Orders	25
III. Organizing the American Church	37
IV. An Independent Church in America	57
V. Philadelphia a Century Ago	69
VI. Bishop White as a Man	77
VII. The Day of Small Beginnings	90
VIII. Inspiring Younger Men	101
IX. Working to Larger Ends	118
X. The Rise of Party Spirit	126
XI. Reminiscences	135
XII. Theologian and Author	153
XIII. The Last Years	164
XIV. A Half Century of Church Life	180
<hr/>	
APPENDIX	193
INDEX	197

INTRODUCTION.

NEXT in interest to the story of beginnings is the story of transplantations. We turn with inexhaustible curiosity to see how it was that a small people became great, — that a few wise and courageous souls led the way in lifting a nation out of ignorance and barbarism up to the high places of the world, out of bondage and poverty up to wealth and power. And the same story only grows more interesting when it takes on that other form in which a nation or a race illustrates its out-populating power in colonization. Indeed, in some aspects of it, this study is more interesting than the other; for however much or little one may hold with Buckle as to the modifying, if not formative, influences upon nations of climate, soil, and the other characteristics of environment, it can never cease to be interesting to note how far race-characteristics, and, above all, great moral and spiritual ideas, have survived exportation, and what inherent force they have revealed to illustrate themselves — to grow and flourish — in a new country.

It is this which will always make the story of the English colonization of America of pre-eminent in-

terest. There are few peoples whose insular position and traditions have made their distinctive traits more marked or characteristic. Indeed, there is no parallel in history to the sturdy dominance of those traits, or the cool and resolute indifference, whether to ridicule or resistance, with which the Englishman has not only transported himself but everything, even to his beer and his bath-tub, to the remotest regions and the most inhospitable climes. In these he has still maintained his undimmed attachment to his fatherland, and his persistent maintenance of its speech and customs. Those of other lineage emigrate, and leave their language and their customs more or less largely behind them. Even Oriental peoples let go their most cherished usages. But the Englishman compels other nations to speak his tongue, to learn his ways, and so, at any rate, to respect his race-attachments.

Colonization has illustrated this fact, both by what it has perpetuated and by what it has modified. And this is the significance of the English transplantation to these shores. In one aspect of it, it was a revolt; in another, it was a reproduction of the best life of a great nation in what we who are Americans believe to have been nobler and larger forms. The Puritan recoil against ecclesiastical intolerance did not indeed express this in form, but it included it in fact; for where it pressed for freedom in one direction, it unconsciously affirmed the righteousness of that freedom in others. If it be said that the note of religious tolerance was not expressed in the Puritan

settlement, it must also be said that the germ of it was present in the lines which determined that settlement. And so with all the rest. The Puritan ideas of civil government, of the family, of personal rights, were not ours; but they were the soil out of which, by no violent transition, these latter have come.

It is doubtful, however, whether they would have come so peacefully and so happily if it had not been for that providential ordering which, in grave emergencies, whether in Church or State, produced the men to meet them. It is impossible to remember the story of our first days, whether in the Colonies or in the Republic, without recognizing the deep and lasting influence for good of a few strong and wise men.

Of one of these this volume tells the story. It was the happy fortune, as men sometimes account such things, of the Church of which he became the Presiding Bishop, to possess in William White one with a singular adaptedness for a difficult and delicate task. An English subject by birth, and an American citizen by deliberate choice and adoption, he belonged to two hemispheres, and included in his beautiful and gracious personality the best traits of both. An English Churchman by baptism and inheritance, when the time came to be an American Churchman, he adjusted himself to his new relations without violence or inconsistency; and in recognizing his obligations to his country, cast no scorn upon the Anglican motherhood from which, both in Church and State, he had sprung.

It was the union of these two which made the former especially odious to a vast majority of his American fellow-citizens. That they had grounds for their dislike of an Established Church, and their apprehension as to its possible encroachment upon their personal liberties, can scarcely be denied; and yet when they proposed to dismiss the Church in which so many of them had been nurtured out of the horizon of their interest or loyal affection, because of their quarrel with the State, they were on the eve of a blunder the proportions of which, in view of the religious possibilities of the near future in America, it is not easy to estimate. For to-day it is beginning to be seen, as it never has been seen before, that the Church of which William White was a bishop has an office of reconciliation which no other body can even pretend to attempt. As one follows the Episcopate of White, it is impossible not to own that his clear and penetrating vision discerned this from afar. And to lay foundations with this larger outlook in view, was his great and unique office.

There have been those who have been ready to resent his prudence, to condemn what they called his excessive timidity, and to protest against what seemed his too easy temper of concession. But it is well to remember that he was confronting emergencies which might easily have had another issue than the one that, as a matter of fact, did come to pass, and that his position was one of pre-eminent difficulty and isolation. In the end his wisdom and moderation, and his equal courage and humility, made a way for him

through all difficulties; and he lived to see a great wish brought to the promise, if no more, of a noble conclusion. Without heat, without bitterness, with an inexhaustible patience and an often marvellous foresight, he made it possible for the Church of England to live again in her Republican daughter, and taught her clergy and laity how to be loyal to their glorious past, and yet sensitive and responsive to their more glorious future.

It is in the study of such a life that they who hope and believe great things for the Church which William White helped to transplant in her completeness to American shores, will find a clew to the problems that confront her to-day; and it is therefore a timely office which the author of this volume has rendered to his fellow-Churchmen and his fellow-countrymen in placing it within their reach.

HENRY C. POTTER.

DIOCESAN HOUSE, NEW YORK.

St. Bartholomew's Day, 1892.



BISHOP WHITE.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY LIFE.

THE White family, like the Washington family, had the distinction of high character and excellent social rank. Both families had an eminent, if not distinguished, English ancestry, and it is as important in the one case as in the other that the two men, one of whom is rightly called the "Father of his country," and the other the Patriarch of the American Episcopal Church, should be traced to some extent in their English connections in order to give weight to their position in the American colonies of Virginia and Pennsylvania. The English history of the family can be traced back through a period of more than three hundred years. The father of Bishop White came to this country in 1721 as a boy to seek his fortune. He was the youngest son and the only member of his family who made his home in the new world. He kept up his intercourse by frequent letters with his three sisters, who shared warmly in their brother's ideas of liberty across the Atlantic. They were themselves Jacobite gentlewomen. The portraits of their parents, painted by Sir Godfrey

Kneller, were sent to their brother in Philadelphia in 1776, and are still in the custody of members of Bishop White's family. They are remarkable pictures. Mr. William White is dressed in the style of a gentleman of the Non-Jurying period in English history, and Elizabeth Leigh, who was apparently much younger than himself, is represented as in the prime of life. It is the portrait of a woman of energy and nerve, and Bishop White records that she had a great deal to do in developing the character of his own father when he was a mere lad in his English home. She was left a widow at an early age and remained such until her death in 1742, at the age of sixty-six.

Thomas White was only sixteen years old when he arrived in Maryland with a hundred guineas in his pocket. His father had been a dissipated man and had died early. He left his wife and six children, of whom Thomas was the youngest, in straitened circumstances. Young White became an apprentice to the clerk of the county of Baltimore, and at the end of his apprenticeship was appointed his deputy. He practically educated himself in the law, and was successful in his profession. He was frugal in his habits, and put all his spare money into lands which had not been taken up from the proprietary office. In addition to this, he was made a colonel of the county militia and appointed to the office of surveyor of the district. He speedily rose to a position of influence, and at the age of forty-two removed to Philadelphia, where he married two years later as his second wife the widow of a Mr. Newman, who was of Quaker ancestry, but had always been

a member of the Episcopal Church, and whose family had been all along connected with it. Concerning his father, who died in September, 1779, in his seventy-fifth year, Bishop White wrote as follows : —

“ My father left the world with the reputation of unsullied integrity through life ; and I think I may say that he possessed a remarkably correct judgment of men and things. In his domestic character he was indulgent and exemplary. During the last twenty-two years of his life, he was so far a cripple, in consequence of a fall from a carriage, as to walk on two canes with handles. This kept him out of all society except such as could be had at his own hospitable table and fireside ; and, except in afternoons [that] of some of the principal gentlemen of the city, of his own age, who in those days habitually assembled at the public coffee-house for society merely.”¹

His mother's maiden name was Esther Hewlings. She was a daughter and grand-daughter of wardens of St. Mary's Church, Burlington, the latter leaving the Society of Friends in the Keithian controversy. They were early settlers of West Jersey, under the purchase made by William Penn before the settlement of Pennsylvania. She had two children by this second marriage, William White and his sister Mary, who was one year younger than himself, and who became the wife of Robert Morris, the “ financier of the Revolution.” His mother died on the last day of the year, 1790, in her seventy-first year. Her son in a letter to Bishop Hobart says : “ My mother, if I am not misled by partiality, possessed an excellent understanding, with

¹ MS. Autobiography addressed to Bishop Hobart.

sincere but unostentatious piety." In further mention of her, he makes grateful acknowledgment of the early impression made by her religious instructions upon his young mind.

William White, who was to be in his early prime the first bishop of the Episcopal Church in America, in the line of the English succession, thus writes of his birth and of his earliest years: —

"It depends on a few hours whether I should be considered born in 1747 or 1748; being a man of Old Style, which began the year on the 25th of March, and I was born on the 24th; so that the change of style brought my birthday to the 4th of April. At the age of seven, I was transferred from the school of a mistress to the English school of the newly erected College of Philadelphia, of which my father was a trustee, having been so from the beginning of the institution, under the name of an academy. The master of the school was Mr. Ebenezer Kinnersley, who often appears in the early works of Dr. Franklin as a co-operator with him in his electrical experiments. At about the age of ten years I went into the Latin school, under the mastership of Mr. Paul Jackson, a man considered as possessed of a fine genius and of classical attainments. Not long after my entrance into the school, he left it. This proved a misfortune to me; it being found convenient to his successor, Mr. John Beveridge, a thorough grammarian, with little else to recommend him, to reduce the number of his classes. In consequence, I was elevated to the one above us, passing from the beginning of an easy book to the latter part of a difficult one to boys of our standing. I record the incident for the purpose of censuring this and every similar expedient for the hastening of boys through grammar schools, which is frequent. At the

age of thirteen, our class being examined for college by the Provost and the Vice-Provost, although three were rejected, I was not one of them. Among the many incidents recollected by me of the sound discretion of my father there is his putting of his prohibition on my then entering of college. It was humiliating at the time, although softened by the permission, obtained at his request, that I should be with the now Head Class in the Latin School, in one part of the day only; the other part to be spent in the school in which arithmetic was taught, and in which usually one hour of the day only was spent by each class in its last year in the Latin school. Had it not been for this postponement, I should not have gone through college, as I trust I did, with reputation. There have since occurred frequent occasions of comparing the conduct of my father with that of others, much to their disadvantage. I was three years in college, my pupilage ending on my birthday in 1765, — which was the last day of examinations, although a month before the commencement!"¹

He was graduated just as he had completed his seventeenth year.

Dr. William Smith, who was Provost of the College when young White entered the lowest room of its academy and when he left it at graduation, was a prominent man in Philadelphia, and was associated with him as a trustee of the College from the year 1774. At a later time, when he had been elected by the convention of Maryland for the Episcopate of that State, Mr. White, who was then Bishop of Pennsylvania, refused to recommend him to the General Convention for this high office, and he adds: "To me his failure was prin-

¹ MS. Autobiography.

cipally owing. My reasons are not detailed, partly because there has been no reproach cast on me on that account, and partly because, in our frequent collisions, I ought not to claim the commendation of an impartial narrator. During his subsequent years we were on very amicable terms." He evidently did not think that Dr. Smith was fitted in temperament and spirit for the Episcopal office, and it was characteristic of him that he was always entirely independent and honest in reaching his decision concerning actions in which he had to take responsibility. Dr. Smith was one of the leaders in the early organization of the Episcopal Church, and his failure to enter the Episcopate did not prevent his rendering efficient service in those early days.

His early inclination toward the ministry is illustrated by a story told by a lady a year and a half older than he was, who was his intimate playmate when they were both children. She used to say when she was herself advanced in life : —

"Billy White was born a bishop. I never could persuade him to play anything but church. He would tie his own or my apron around his neck for a gown and stand before a low chair which he called his pulpit ; I, seated before him on a little bench, was the congregation, and he always preached to me about being good. One day I heard him crying, and saw the nurse running into the street, calling to him to come back and be dressed. He refused, saying, 'I do not want to go to dancing-school, and I won't be dressed, for I don't think it is good to learn to dance.' And that was the only time I ever knew Billy White to be a naughty boy." When this lady in his later life repeated these reminiscences of his childhood to the Bishop, they

amused him, and he added that his mother, finding him so unwilling to learn to dance, gave it up, "though," he continued, "I am by no means opposed to others learning, if they like to dance."¹

His own account of himself after graduation is the best statement that can be given of the influence which led him to study for the ministry : —

"My leaving of the College, being at the point of time when the choice of a profession ought to be final, there shall be noticed the circumstances which led to its being in favour of the ministry. It may be recorded with truth, but let it be with humility and with sorrow for innumerable failures, and for the having fallen far short of what was due to the advantages of early years, that there is not recollected any portion of my life, during which I was altogether regardless of the obligations of religion, or neglectful of the duty of prayer. But in about the middle of my sixteenth year, there occurred some circumstances, particularly the decease of an amiable young lady of my own age, but in whom I had not felt any further interest than as an acquaintance of my sister. This event gave to my mind a tendency to religious exercises and inquiries, which were also promoted by its being understood that a visit was to be expected from the Rev. George Whitefield. His former visits had been principally before my birth ; and the last of them had been when I was too young to have retained the recollection of his person. His coming at this time caused religion to be more than commonly a subject of conversation, and this added to the existing tendency of my mind. I heard him with great delight in his wonderful elocution, although informed that it was greatly impaired by the state of his health, which had evidently affected his throat and had

¹ Dr. Bird Wilson's Memoir, p. 21.

swelled his person, reported to have been naturally slender. Under this disadvantage, his force of emphasis and the melodies of his tones and cadences exceeded what I have ever witnessed in any other person.”¹

Again he says : —

“Even before my graduation, and especially after it, the expectation of my being for the ministry had drawn to me the kind attentions of the clergy, particularly of Dr. Peters and Mr. Duché, the rector and one of the assistant ministers of Christ Church and St. Peter’s, to the former of which our family belonged. Although I shall always remember those two gentlemen with respect and affection, on account of their merits and their kindness to me, yet there was in each of them a singularity of religious character which lessened the profit of an intercourse with them. Dr. Peters was a native of England, and had come to this country nearly forty years before the time now spoken of. He was then a young clergyman, of a respectable family in Liverpool, of an excellent education, and of polished manners. It was said that his acquaintance had been cultivated by the genteel families of the city, but that, being no favourite with the then rector of Christ Church, the Rev. Archibald Cummings, he accepted from the Proprietary Government the secretaryship of the land office, which laid the foundation of a considerable fortune. He was also the secretary of a succession of governors, and continued to be of the governor’s council until his decease. At an age turned of sixty, he gave up his lucrative offices and became more serious in religious concerns than at any former period of his life, although his morals had been correct, his attendance on public worship constant and solemn, and his preaching occasional. Soon after, the rectorship of the

¹ MS. Autobiography.

church becoming vacant, by the decease of the Rev. Dr. Tenney, the successor of Mr. Cummings, Mr. Peters was chosen to it. The singularity alluded to was his adopting of the notions of Jacob Behmen and William Law, in consequence of which his sermons were not always understood. In social discourse he could be exceedingly entertaining on an ordinary and on any literary subject, especially if it regarded classical or historical learning. Yet, from the moment of turning the conversation to religion, he was in the clouds.

“Mr. Duché was of a respectable family in this city [Philadelphia]. He was in the first-class of graduates of our College, and having finished his studies in it with reputation, he spent some time in the English University of Cambridge. A remarkably fine voice and graceful action helped to render him very popular as a preacher. His disposition also was amiable. The greatest infirmity attending him was a tendency to change in religious sentiment. A few years after his ministerial settlement, he took to the mysticism of Jacob Behmen and William Law. From this he became detached for a time, and his preaching, which was more zealous than either before or after, seemed to me to border on Calvinism, although, probably, he was not aware of or designed it. In this interval my personal knowledge with him began, and, having one day asked of him the loan of Law’s works, then much talked of, I received a refusal, and the reason given being the danger he had formerly been in from the reading of those books. He relapsed, however, to the theory of the Mystics, and continued in it until the troubles [arose] which drove him from his native country. In England, he became a convert to the opinions of Baron Swedenborg, and in these he continued until his decease. . . . In recollecting the pleasure taken in his conversation, I think myself singularly happy in not having been drawn by it from what then

and ever since I have considered as correct views of our holy religion.”¹

No better account of his life while under the pastoral charge and spiritual direction of these revered clergymen can be found than that which he has himself furnished in the short autobiography already quoted from : —

“From the time of my graduation in May, 1765, to that of my going to England, October, 1770, I employed myself in attention to sacred and other literature, perhaps not without some profit. Yet that portion of my life is now looked back on as what might have been much more improved by literary cultivation, and thus have prevented the deficiencies which have been the unavoidable result of a multiplicity of concerns. This is the proper place of recording the benefit received in conjunction with four other youths designed for the ministry, by a species of theological exercise, instituted on the proposal of the Rev. Dr. Smith, the Provost of the College. During three successive seasons and within the space of a few months of each, on Sunday evenings, these exercises were performed in the hall of the old College, then not much less in size than either of our two churches, and in the audience of numerous and respectable assemblies. The ground-work of what we wrote and delivered was the history of the Bible. On each evening two of our company delivered their compositions, previously corrected by the Provost, who afterwards enlarged on the subject. Although this was far from being a complete course of ecclesiastical study, it called to a variety of reading and to a concentration of what was read. There was also use in the introduction to public speaking. The young men with whom I was associated were Thomas Coombe, Thomas Hopkinson, brother of the late Judge Hopkinson, John Montgomery, and Joseph Hutchins.”

¹ MS. Autobiography.

This was the best substitute possible for a theological training at that time in the British colonies of North America.

In the absence of a bishop for the American colonies, all candidates for the Christian ministry in this country were obliged to go to England for ordination. The Bishop of London had nominal jurisdiction of the American clergy and parishes. Dr. Richard Terrick was then the Bishop of London, and William White embarked for England in October, 1770, to obtain orders at his hands. He was ordained deacon in the following December Ember season in the Royal Chapel, of which the Bishop of London was dean. He was not yet old enough to receive priest's orders, and continued about a year and a half in England, spending a great part of the time with two aunts, the sisters of his father, until he should reach the requisite age. His life with them and his journeys in different parts of England caused the time to pass rapidly and delightfully. It may here be further said of the family in England, with whom his father had kept up a constant correspondence since he came to this country, that his grandfather became so dissipated that he left his wife and six children without property. His widow was equal to the emergency, and had recourse to millinery for subsistence, and brought up her daughters to the same business. The eldest son became a silk mercer; a younger son went out to the East Indies and soon died there; the youngest of the family, who came to America, was the father of Bishop White. The three sisters, after losing their mother, the two married ones

having in the mean time lost their husbands, lived together, chiefly on jointures and annuities, purchased by their profit in business, in a genteel competency at Twickenham. It was to him that they bequeathed at death their entire estate, amounting to about £3,000 sterling. When young White made his first visit to England, one of the sisters had just passed away. Of the others he writes as follows : —

“ I was received by the survivors, Miss White and Mrs. Weeks, as a son. They were excellent women, which was also the character of their deceased sister. The eldest in particular [has been] ever since considered by me as one of the finest women I ever knew. With an excellent understanding, exemplary piety, and great dignity of manner, she possessed the vivacity of youth at above the age of seventy.”¹

His father had advised him to be cautious on political subjects, especially the claims of Stuarts, when among his English relatives. He continues : —

“ After a while, familiarity banished reserve on the subject of politics, when I learned from these ladies that they had been educated in the principles of Jacobitism, but had long given up the cause as desperate, — the readier on account of their respect for the personal character of the present King. I did not fail to acknowledge to them that both their brother and his son, although neither of them had ever entered zealously into political party, were attached to the principles of the British Constitution, as confirmed, not introduced, by the Revolution of 1688.”

While in England at this time he made numerous journeys to different parts, visiting Lancashire, Liverpool,

¹ MS. Autobiography.

Derbyshire, Oxford and its Universities, and meeting a large number of the men then eminent in the English Church. One of the foremost men in literature whom he found at the University was Dr. Samuel Johnson. He thus writes about him in his autobiography : —

“My introduction to him was a letter from the Rev. Jonathan Odell, formerly missionary at Burlington. The doctor was very civil to me. I visited him occasionally, and I know some who would be tempted to envy me the felicity of having one morning found him in the act of preparing his dictionary for a new edition. His harshness of manners never displayed itself to me, except in one instance, when he told me that, had he been Prime Minister during the then recent controversy concerning the Stamp Act, he would have sent a ship of war and levelled one of our principal cities to the ground. On the other hand, I have heard from him sentiments expressive of a feeling heart, and convincing me that he would not have done as he said. Having dined in company with him in Kensington, at the house of Mr. Elphinstone, well-known to scholars of that day, and returning in the stage-coach with the doctor, I mentioned to him there being a Philadelphia edition of his ‘Prince of Abyssinia.’ He expressed a wish to see it. I promised to send him a copy on my return to Philadelphia, and did so. He returned a polite answer, which is printed in Mr. Boswell’s second edition of his ‘Life of Dr. Johnson.’ Mr. Abercrombie’s admiration of Dr. Johnson had led to a correspondence with Mr. Boswell, to whom with my consent the letter was sent.

“This reminds me of another literary character, a friend of Johnson, Dr. Goldsmith. We lodged for some time near to one another, in the Brick Court of the Temple. I had it intimated to him by an acquaintance of both that I wished for the pleasure of making him a visit. It ensued,

and in our conversation it took a turn which incited in me a painful sensation from the circumstance that a man of such a genius should write for bread. His 'Deserted Village' came under notice, and some remarks were made by us on the principle of it — the decay of the peasantry. He said that were he to write a pamphlet on the subject, he could prove the point incontrovertibly. On his being asked why he did not set his mind to this, his answer was: 'It is not worth my while. A good poem will bring me a hundred guineas, but the pamphlet would bring me nothing.' This was a short time before my leaving of England, and I saw the doctor no more."

CHAPTER II.

IN HOLY ORDERS.

IN June, 1772, Mr. White was ordained a priest by Dr. Terrick, the then Bishop of London, and embarked immediately for Philadelphia, where he arrived, after a tedious passage, on the 13th of September. There were then only two parishes identified with the Church of England in that city, though several congregations were gathered in the colony. Christ Church was the first parish in Philadelphia, and it was twelve years after the founding of the city, when the population could not have been more than four or five thousand, in 1695, before the Churchmen identified with this parish undertook to build an edifice, partly of wood and partly of brick, in which they could worship God after the forms of the Church of England. St. Peter's Church was established half a century later, in 1758, at the request of a number of the leading citizens of Philadelphia, because another place of worship was much wanted. It was undertaken by the direction of the vestry of Christ Church, and was simply another church in that parish. In 1765 a charter was granted by Governor Penn to the united churches. Mr. White had been baptized in Christ Church in his infancy; he had attended its services from his youth until he

went to England to receive holy orders ; his father had been identified with it as a parishioner, and he was the bright and shining light of the company of people who worshipped there, and who constituted a fair proportion of the best social life of Philadelphia at that time. It was hardly a month after his return, when he and a young man, Mr. Coombe, who had made the voyage to England at an earlier period and had been a London curate, were elected as the assistant ministers in these two churches. The rector, Dr. Peters, had requested that Mr. White might be appointed to this position while he was yet in England, and it is a signal instance of the spirit in which he began his work that he recognized the limited means of the parish, which were barely sufficient to provide for the rector and the Rev. Mr. Duché, who had charge of St. Peter's, and desired that what might be specially done by the congregation for him might be paid to his brother assistant. In a letter to Dr. Peters, he said : " Whilst I officiate in these churches, I shall always be satisfied with what they can afford to offer me from their regular funds, and not expect to receive any part of what may be raised in some new way." He received a salary of one hundred pounds per annum from the rector, and at the special request of the vestry was induced to take fifty out of the two hundred pounds which the congregation had raised for himself and Mr. Coombe. From this time onward until his connection with these churches ended with his death in 1836, the question of salary was never raised by him. The united churches paid him what they felt able to. Though he

lost in the Revolutionary war at least ten thousand pounds from the paternal estate by the depreciation of the currency, the position of his family and his own subsequent circumstances were such, in connection with his modest ways of living, that he was able to maintain his place among the foremost citizens of Philadelphia out of his own income. This incidentally had much to do with his comfort and success at a time when the church in Pennsylvania had no spare funds, and the clergy were often without fixed salaries and without the means of subsistence. Mr. White, as presbyter and bishop, never knew what it was to be without a comfortable support.

In February, 1773, he was married to Miss Mary Harrison, to whom he had been tenderly attached for some time before his voyage to England. She was of English descent, and her father had been for some time the mayor of Philadelphia. He was also one of the wardens of Christ Church when it was the only Episcopal parish in the city. With this lady he lived in uninterrupted harmony until her death on the 13th of December, 1797. In the family record which he made of the births of his children this date is followed immediately by the words, "Mrs. White departed this life." He always spoke of her as Mrs. White, in the tenderest terms, but with a reserve which indicated that the affection was too strong and the sense of loss too deep to be treated with freedom.

Concerning his home at this period, his great-grandson, in the "Notes of the White Family," writes thus : —

“The early part of the married life of Bishop White was passed in the house at the southwest corner of Pine and Front Streets, upon the site of which now stands St. Peter’s House, that noble establishment of St. Peter’s Church. Some months before his marriage he had been appointed one of the assistant ministers of Christ Church and St. Peter’s, — and as junior assistant his duties may have been given principally to St. Peter’s Church, — whence the reason for establishing himself in its near vicinity. In his study in this house were planned, upon the close of the war, all the measures looking to a union of the clergy and congregations of the Commonwealth, out of which period came the federate Union of the churches in all the States forming the American Church.”

His ministry was without notable incident until the troubles between Great Britain and the colonies led to the War of the Revolution. His position in this conflict is best stated in his autobiography: —

“Long before that period [the Revolutionary War], I had carefully studied the English history, and my reading in the department had been considerable. The principles which I had adopted are those which enter into the Constitution of England from the Saxon times, however the fact may have been disguised, and were confirmed and acted on at the Revolution in 1688. The late measures of the English government contradicted the rights which the colonists had brought with them to the wilds of America and were, until then, respected by the mother country. The worst state of dependent provinces has been that which bound them to a country itself free. . . . Our quarrel was substantially with our free fellow-subjects of Great Britain, and we never objected to the constitutional prerogative of the Crown until it threw us out of its protection. This it did, independently on other measures, by what was

called the Prohibitory Act passed in November, 1775, authorizing the seizure of all vessels belonging to persons of this country, whether friends or foes. The Act arrived about the time of the publication of Paine's 'Common Sense.' Had the Act been contrived by some person in league with Paine, in order to give effect to his production, no expedient could have been more ingenious. To a reader of that flimsy work at the present day the confessed effect of it at the time is a matter of surprise. Had it [been] issued six months sooner, it would have excited no feeling except that of resentment against the author. But there had come a crisis which the foremost leaders of American resistance were reluctant to realize to their minds."

In a subsequent note he adds : —

"Even in regard to war, there is a fact which shows how far it was from being sought for or anticipated by the American people. The Congress of 1774 concluded their address to them with the advice to be prepared for all events; and yet, until the shedding of blood at Lexington in April, 1775, there was no preparation beyond the immediate vicinity of the British army in Boston. The secretary of Congress, Mr. Charles Thomson, subsequently expressed to me his surprise at its not being generally understood that the Congress perceived the probability of what came to pass, and were of opinion that it should be prepared for, by being provided with the means of resistance."

Mr. White does not hesitate to say that —

"perhaps had the issue depended upon my determination, it would have been for submission, with the determined and steady continuance of the rightful claim. But, when my countrymen in general had chosen the dreadful measure of forcible resistance, — for certainly the spirit was almost

universal at the time of arming — it was the dictate of conscience to take what seemed the right side. When matters were verging to independence, there was less to be said for dissent from the voice of the country than in the beginning.”

Mr. White took no extreme position. He continues : —

“Although possessed of these sentiments, I never beat the ecclesiastical drum. My two brethren in the assistant ministry preached animating sermons, approbatory of the war, which were printed, as did the most prominent of our clergy — Dr. Smith. Our aged rector [Dr. Peters], in consequence of increasing weakness, was retiring from the world. Not long before this time he resigned his rectorship, was succeeded by Rev. Mr. Duché, and soon after died. Being invited to preach before a battalion, I declined and mentioned to the colonel, who was one of the warmest spirits of the day, my objections to the making of the ministry instrumental to the war. I continued, as did all of us, to pray for the King until Sunday [inclusively] before the 4th of July, 1776. Within a short time after, I took the oath of allegiance to the United States, and have since remained faithful to it. My intentions were upright, and most seriously weighed. I hope that they were not in contrariety to my duty.”

The materials are scanty for details of the life of Mr. White at this period. In September, 1777, he retired with his family to the house of his brother-in-law, Mr. Aquila Hall, in Maryland. The British were then advancing upon Philadelphia, and the Continental Congress had fled to Yorktown. Says Mr. White : —

“Just before breaking up they had chosen me their chaplain. They chose with me the Rev. Mr. Duffield, of the Presbyterian communion. Nothing could have induced me

to accept the appointment, at such a time, even had the emolument been an object, as it was not, but the determination to be consistent in my principles, and in the part taken. Under this impression, I divided my time between Congress and my family, which the double chaplaincy permitted, until the evacuation of the city in the June following."

He accepted the chaplainship a few days before the capture of General Burgoyne, at a time when it looked as if the British army might advance southward from the frontier of New York and sever the Eastern States from the Southern. Bishop Kemper gives some interesting facts about this chaplainship, which are best related in his own words:—

"He had removed with his family to Maryland; and being on a journey, he stopped at a small village between Harford county and Philadelphia, at which he was met by a courier from Yorktown, informing him of his being appointed by Congress their chaplain, and requesting his immediate attendance. He thought of it for a short time; it was in one of the gloomiest periods of the American affairs, when General Burgoyne was marching without having yet received a serious check, so far as was then known, through the northern parts of New York; and after his short consideration, instead of proceeding on his journey, he turned his horses' heads, travelled immediately to Yorktown, and entered on the duties of his appointment."¹

This was when the finances for carrying on the war were at their lowest ebb, and when, though this body soon returned to Philadelphia, it was alike destitute of funds and of credit. On one occasion, going into

¹ Dr. Wilson's Memoir, p. 55.

the chamber of Congress to perform his duty as chaplain, he remarked to one of the members : " You have been treating yourselves, I perceive, to new inkstands." " Yes," was the reply, " and private credit had to be pledged for the payment." At another time, observing that the clerks had removed from their usual room and inquiring the cause, he was told that there was no wood to make the fire there nor money to buy it. He continued as chaplain until Congress was removed to New York, and when, after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the government was again established at Philadelphia, he was once more chosen for this service, and continued to be so chosen at each successive session by the Senate, until the removal of the government to Washington in the year 1801.

Everywhere it was difficult to maintain services in the parishes of the Church of England during the war. While Mr. White was absent from Philadelphia, his friend, the Rev. Mr. Duché, had become so obnoxious to his country in consequence of a letter written by him to General Washington, that he had gone to England. In this letter he entreated him to use his influence with Congress for the putting an end to the war, and in the event of their refusing, to negotiate at the head of his army. Mr. White says : —

" It was a very incorrect measure, but induced by despair of the American cause, and to spare the effusion of blood. On the other hand, Mr. Duché must have been aware that his having officiated as chaplain to Congress, even after the Declaration of Independence, was known to his superiors in England. To appease in that quarter was the professed object of his voyage."

When the English army entered Philadelphia in September, 1777, after officiating at Christ Church, and after praying for the King in the service, he was arrested at the door of the church and conducted to jail, where he remained but one night, his friends in the mean time making known his change of sentiment. Mr. White cites this as one of the many instances where the British officers violated their promise of protection to the people whom they invited to stay in their respective homes, and who were made to suffer on account of their submission to the English government. Writing in 1819 of the condition of the American Church at this time, Mr. White says : —

“ The present state and prospects of our church exhibit a contrast fruitful of satisfaction, compared with the period when I was the only officiating clergyman of our church in the State. Our settled clergy of the province, exclusively of the city, had been never more than six, and these were supported principally by stipends from England. During the Revolutionary war some had died, and the others had retired to England, except Dr. Smith, who remained until what took place subsequently in the College. He then removed to Maryland, and set on foot his measures for the founding of a College in Chestertown, in which he had accepted the parish, and another in Annapolis. I was now in a trying situation, in the parochial cure of the churches to which my services had been and have been ever since devoted. The difficulty was in regard to the warm spirits of Whigs and Tories, as they were called. With the latter the danger was the absenting of themselves from the churches, in the devotions of which the new allegiance was acknowledged. That some took this part for a time is certain ; but it is remarkable

that of these there were scarcely any who had professed conscientious scruples against resistance, and that they were chiefly persons who had engaged in it without calculating the consequences, and had afterwards inconsistently relinquished it. The prejudice wore away gradually. With the hot Whigs it was more difficult to deal because of the present season of success, and because they who stayed [in the city] had become in some measure identified with the enemy, whose conduct had been in many instances wantonly oppressive, although, it must be confessed, with very little discrimination between friends and foes. There arose great danger of the introduction of a political creed into the churches, which might have distracted them for many years. But the heat became allayed by some judicious men on the same side in politics, who convinced them that, instead of endeavouring to annul the last election of vestrymen, it would be best to let all things remain quiet until the next Easter [the time appointed by charter for the annual election]. On the arrival of that period the changes were very few, and consisted chiefly in restoring members who had been left out, for no other reason than because, being out of the lines, they could not attend to the duty. The vestry, after the election at Easter, voted the rectorship vacant. This was not unexpected, but [it] placed me in delicate circumstances, on account of my long friendship for Mr. Duché, whose return, considering his attainder and the indignation excited by the aforesaid letter, was at present out of question. There was seen the hazard of some share of the same indignation, when it was stated in the acceptance of the rectorship that, if ever the former rector should return to this country by the permission of the civil authority and with the wishes of the members of the churches, I should think it my duty to resign. It was so entered on the minutes at my desire. When he returned in 1792, his engaging in the ministerial

duty [on account of a slight paralysis] was to be despaired of. My election to the rectorship was unanimous."

While the war was still going on, it was impossible for Mr. Duché to return to America, but the affection between him and his former assistant was not impaired by their political differences. When he returned to Philadelphia in 1792, Bishop White entertained him for several weeks under his own roof, with his family. It was while Mr. Duché was his guest, that he visited President Washington, who treated him with great courtesy. The only further incident that concerns the life of Mr. White at this time is his part in the concerns of the College of Philadelphia, of which he had then been a trustee for about six years. A contest was in progress to take it out of the hands of Churchmen, which Mr. White could not consent to. Party spirit was then at a great height, and the attack upon the College was the result of it. Its charter was changed, and the institution was taken out of the hands of Churchmen and received the name of the University of Pennsylvania, when Mr. White was in Maryland attending the funeral of his father. An attempt was made to place Mr. White at the head of the new institution as Provost, and he was partially inclined, on the side of his literary tastes, to encourage this effort, but he lost the position by one vote. The injustice done to the College¹ gave birth to the Episcopal Academy, and an effort was made to restore to the former trustees of the College their chartered rights and their

¹ He was its treasurer from 1775 to 1789.

estate ;¹ but the bad management of the new institution prevented it, from the start, from being what it might have been, and forbade the hope of this restoration. One of the first acts of the new institution in conferring degrees was to give to Mr. White the honour of the doctorate of divinity in 1782. Dr. White's political opinions were maintained during this critical period with moderation and calmness. He was never willing to be a partisan, and he held that the members of the Episcopal Church should conduct their ecclesiastical affairs without regard to their differences in political opinions. His own sentiments were favourable to the Federal party, and he was not slow to express them or to use his vote at elections. From the first he was opposed to the introduction of religious ideas into politics.

¹ The fight was not so much against Churchmen as such as against Dr. Smith and his friends as politicians. It has been the style thus to becloud the controversy, but more patient investigation makes the motive clear.

CHAPTER III.

ORGANIZING THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

IN his letter to Bishop Hobart, Dr. White says : —

“On the taking of place of the peace of 1783 a new responsibility was induced on the consciences of the few of us remaining of the old stock of the clergy. Not long before, despairing of a speedy acknowledgment of our independence, although there was not likely to be more of war, and perceiving our ministry gradually approaching to an annihilation, I wrote and published a small pamphlet called ‘The Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered.’ It has been faulted from inattention to the precise time of its being issued.”

In a note to this statement he adds the following : —

“In agreement with the sentiments expressed in that pamphlet, I am still of opinion that in an exigency in which a duly authorized ministry cannot be obtained, the paramount duty of preaching the Gospel and the worshipping of God on the terms of the Christian covenant should go on in the best manner which circumstances permit. In regard to the Episcopacy, I think that it should be sustained as the government of the Church from the time of the Apostles, but without criminating the ministry of other churches, as is the course taken by the Church of England.”

This pamphlet was published and advertised on the 6th of August, 1782, and some copies had been dis-

tribute a few days before. Within forty-eight hours it was announced that General Carlton had made the first overture to General Washington looking to the recognition of our Independence, and after August 8th the advertisement was withdrawn, and all the copies already issued recalled. These dates are necessary to explain why Dr. White advocated the measures set forth in this pamphlet, which in later years was represented as his full and unlimited opinion of ecclesiastical authority. They were directed only toward the making of a temporary organization which was to be completed as soon as an opportunity should occur to obtain the Episcopal succession. In an appendix to his charge to the Church in 1807 Bishop White expresses his mature belief "that under the state of things contemplated some such expedient as that proposed must have been resorted to; although had the proposal been delayed a little longer, the happy change of prospects would have prevented the appearance of the pamphlet, unless with considerable alterations." It was written from an intimate knowledge of the condition of the American Episcopal parishes at that time. Dr. White had corresponded with the influential friends of the Church in the several States, with the few who were then left of the eighty parochial clergymen who were residing, when the Revolutionary War began, to the northward and to the eastward of Maryland, and with those then remaining in Maryland and in Virginia, and had found that, on account of the entire absence of the authority of the Episcopate as a resident influence in the American colonies from the beginning, there was an exceedingly

slight sense of the principles of ecclesiastical government in the minds of the laity, and a strong feeling of the uncertainty of maintaining the Episcopal orders on the part of the clergy. Dr. White's pamphlet was written in view of these facts, and when peace was concluded in January, 1783, there was no longer any reason for insisting upon the provisional organization which he had urged.

In substance the general principles embraced in it were these : The Church was to be free from subjection to any spiritual jurisdiction connected with the temporal authority of a foreign state. Everything was to be avoided that had the look of making the churches subservient to party, or of uniting their members on questions of a civil nature. The laity as well as the clergy were to have a share in the government of the Church. The power of electing the superior order of ministers was to be in the clergy and the laity together. In the deprivation of the superior order of the clergy there should be no interference of the civil authority, and all action should be in the Church at large and entirely ecclesiastical. The parochial churches were to be on an equality, and each parish should retain every power that need not be delegated for the good of the whole. In the absence of funds for the support of the superior order of the clergy, it was stated that their duties should not be allowed to interfere with their employment as parochial clergymen, and their superintendence was consequently to be confined to small districts. The particular organization here proposed comprehended permanent superintending ministers with

powers similar to those of bishops. The individual churches were to be associated in small districts, in each of which the minister should be a delegate to a convention composed of representatives elected from the vestry or congregation of the churches which they served. A permanent president was to be chosen, who with other clergymen appointed by the body might exercise powers purely spiritual, powers of ordination and discipline over the clergy, according to reasonable laws. The United States was to be divided into three large districts, each of which should have an annual assembly, consisting of members from the smaller districts within it, equally composed of clergy and laity, and voted for by those orders promiscuously, the presiding clergyman being always one. In addition to this, there was to be a body representing the whole Church, consisting of members from each of the larger districts chosen from clergy and laity equally, which should meet statedly once in three years. On the point of Episcopacy, the churches were not to be far from this mode of government, and whatever was lacking to the integrity of the system was to be supplied when the succession could be obtained.

There was nothing essentially contradictory, in this provisional system of government, to the order of the Episcopal Church ; and in this outline it is possible to trace the original features of the organization which was attempted as soon after the peace with Great Britain as the clergy and laity could be conveniently brought together. The difficulties in the way of such action were great. Intercourse by letter was slow and

expensive, and the churches in the New England States were practically separated from those in the Middle and Southern Atlantic States. All the parishes were disabled; many of the houses of worship had been destroyed or desecrated; and it was a difficult matter to bring about unity of action. As soon as Independence had been declared, a few young men to the southward, who had been educated for the ministry, sailed for England, and applied to Dr. Lowth, the then Bishop of London, for holy orders. Bishop Lowth could not ordain them until an act of Parliament had been obtained, allowing him to dispense with the oaths of allegiance; and while they were waiting for this obstacle to be removed, Mr. John Adams, then the Minister of the United States to the Court of St. James, prepared the way for the obtaining of Episcopal ordination for these young men from the Danish Church. But this action could not be accepted except in a special exigency, which did not occur. There was a simultaneous demand in the Southern and Middle States that some association should be effected under which the churches might act as a body, and Dr. White, in his "*Memoirs of the Church*," thus describes the way in which this came about: —

"The first step towards the forming of a collective body of the Episcopal Church in the United States was taken at a meeting for another purpose of a few clergymen of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, at Brunswick, in New Jersey, on the 11th and 12th of May, 1784. These clergymen, in consequence of prior correspondence, had met for the purpose of consulting, in what way they could

renew a society that had existed under charters of incorporation from the Governors of the said three States, for the support of widows and children of deceased clergymen. Here it was determined to procure a larger meeting on the fifth of the ensuing October, in New York; not only for the purpose of reviving the said charitable institution, but to confer and agree on some general principles of union for the Episcopal Church throughout the States. Such a meeting was held, at the time and place agreed on; and, although the members composing it were not vested with powers adequate to the present exigencies of the Church, they happily, and with great unanimity, laid down a few general principles, to be recommended in the respective States, as the ground on which a future ecclesiastical government should be established.”¹

These principles of ecclesiastical union, to be submitted to the churches in the several States, were as follows:—

“1. That there shall be a General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

“2. That the Episcopal Church in each State send deputies to the Convention, consisting of clergy and laity.

“3. That associated congregations, in two or more States, may send deputies jointly.

“4. That the said Church shall maintain the doctrines of the Gospel, as now held by the Church of England; and shall adhere to the liturgy of the said Church, as far as shall be consistent with the American Revolution and the constitutions of the respective States.

“5. That in every State, where there shall be a bishop duly consecrated and settled, he shall be considered as a member of the Convention, *ex-officio*.

¹ Memoirs of the Church, 3d ed., p. 19.

"6. That the clergy and laity, assembled in convention, shall deliberate in one body, but shall vote separately; and the concurrence of both shall be necessary to give validity to every measure.

"7. That the first meeting of the Convention shall be at Philadelphia, the Tuesday before the feast of St. Michael next."

Up to this time all action had been voluntary on the part of the clergy and laity. The object had been to consult together to see what could be done. At an earlier date there had been a gathering of the clergy in Maryland for the purpose of choosing a bishop, and Dr. William Smith, then the leading man among the Maryland clergy, had been chosen for this office. It was at this meeting that the title "Protestant Episcopal Church" was used for the first time. It is to be noted that with two exceptions no clergy from the New England States were present at these preliminary meetings. The reason for this was that "the more northern clergymen were under apprehension of there being a disposition on the part of the more southern to make material deviation from the ecclesiastical system of England, in the article of Church government." This is a reference by Dr. White to his pamphlet on "The Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered," which had alarmed the clergy of Connecticut and Massachusetts, who held strictly to the perpetuation of the Church of England in this country, with only the slightest adjustment of the Prayer-book to the new conditions under which it was to be used. There was

¹ Dr. Wilson's "Memoir," p. 102.

also an objection to the introduction of the laity into the Church councils. It is with reference to this state of things that Dr. White, in his "Memoirs of the Church," wonders "that any sensible and well-informed persons should overlook the propriety of accommodating that system, in some respects, to the prevailing sentiments and habits of the people of this country, now become an independent and combined commonwealth." He was not slow to take action in Pennsylvania to prepare for the approaching Convention of the churches in the different States, which was to be held at Philadelphia in September, 1785. The preliminary steps to this end were taken at his own house March 29, 1784. This was only a few days before the first gathering of the American clergy at New Brunswick. The first convention of the congregations in Pennsylvania took place in May, 1784. Dr. White was unanimously chosen president, and clerical and lay deputies were appointed to attend the General Convention of the States to be held in the following September, in Philadelphia, Dr. White being one of the number.

It is now necessary to go back a little in order to pick up another part of the narrative. A meeting of the clergy of Connecticut, ten in number, in the quiet village of Woodbury, in the last week of March, 1783, hardly more than two months after peace had been declared, called to take action with reference to the proper organization of the American Church, was really the first step in a single State to secure the Episcopal authority in the United States. It resulted

in the choice of Samuel Seabury, the leading clergyman in Connecticut at that time, as their future bishop. The clergy were determined that no effort should be neglected to thwart what seemed to be the attempt to create an Episcopal Church without episcopacy, which Dr. White appeared to them then to have in mind, and Dr. Seabury was immediately dispatched to London to see what he could do to obtain consecration from the English bishops. He found it impossible to remove the obstacles in his way. For twelve months he persisted in his task without success. The difficulty was that Church and State were so connected in England that Parliament must pass a statute releasing foreign bishops from the oath of allegiance, before Americans, with whom the English had just concluded peace, could be consecrated to the office of bishops, even for their own country ; and the time was not ripe for any such action. In his despair Dr. Seabury sought the Primus of Scotland, Bishop Kilgour of Aberdeen, and after much opposition from those who had been determined that no efforts should be spared to prevent the consecration of an American bishop, he was consecrated in the private chapel of the Bishop-Coadjutor of Aberdeen, on the 14th of November, 1784. This was the consummation of the first wish of Bishop Seabury's heart and the great endeavour of his life, and it vastly changed the situation in the American States ; but when he returned to Connecticut, he found that steps had already been taken for the organization of the Episcopal churches upon a more comprehensive plan than had been attempted by the clergy of Con-

necticut. During his absence the Massachusetts clergy had met in Boston, and had adopted principles similar to those which had been accepted at the meeting in New York in September, 1784, but later on they manifested a disposition not to take a part in the Convention invited to assemble at Philadelphia on the 27th of September, 1785.¹ It is important to dwell upon these facts, because they represent two lines of divergence which have existed from the first in the American Episcopal Church, and which grew out of the develop-

¹ How little exchange of opinion and understanding of the situation among Churchmen there was in those days, is illustrated by the conduct of the Connecticut Churchmen at this time toward the scattered churches in the new American States. When Dr. White, then but thirty-four years of age, at what seemed to him the great crisis in the Revolution, put forth the pamphlet entitled "The Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered," which was intended to bridge over a difficulty that could not be surmounted, they were not slow, seven months after the exigency had passed which it was intended to serve, to read him an instructive homily on his venturing outside of Episcopacy in a struggle for life and mere existence, overlooking the fact that every copy within reach had long been withdrawn; and yet they had not the friendliness to tell the young Philadelphian that they had appointed Samuel Seabury to go abroad to seek consecration. This he learned at New Brunswick in May, 1784, when Mr. Moore informed him of the Woodbury transaction which had taken place *fourteen* months before! This single incident shows the difference of feeling between the two sections of the American Church, and how little the Connecticut brethren realized the larger problem with which they had to deal; but all these misunderstandings were cleared away, when, later on, the two bishops met together and laboured jointly for the common good of the Church.

ment of the Church among two different sorts of people during the colonial period.

The parishes of the English Church in New England were composed partly of persons who had been won over from Puritanism and partly of English colonists who had been brought up in the old faith. Early in the eighteenth century large numbers of the native New England people had embraced the principles of what Governor Winthrop called "our dear Mother, the Church of England," especially in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and had become what might be called strong Churchmen. They held their opinions with intense conviction and were as forward and active in their religion as in their politics. The Church people of New York shared these intense convictions to a certain extent with them; but in the other parts of the Atlantic seaboard where the English Church had a foothold the people were of a different type of character, and this to some extent modified their Churchmanship. The Quaker and German elements largely coloured the type of Episcopacy in Pennsylvania, and in Delaware the Swedish element was a determining factor. In Maryland and in Virginia the old proprietary system had a controlling influence, and the clergy were more eminent in religion than in morals. The people like the clergy were unwilling to submit to discipline, and with their bishop at the head of the largest diocese in the world, and three thousand miles away, it was impossible to maintain ecclesiastical discipline. Still further south, in the Carolinas, the spiritual condition was not much better. When peace was declared be-

tween Great Britain and the American colonies the political connection between the new States was not much more concrete than the ecclesiastical ties. New England was a section quite by itself, and the Middle and Southern States were essentially identified in public matters. It is not strange that in ecclesiastical affairs, with these two hereditary conditions which sprang from the soil, there should be a stronger and a different type of Churchmanship in New England from that which prevailed to the southward. In New England the clergy with unreasonable haste had proceeded to elect a bishop without the consent of the laity, without previously preparing the way for it by a proper organization of the parishes, and without reporting their action to the parishes in the other States. It was partly on account of the absence of authoritative credentials beyond the testimony of the clergy, that Dr. Seabury, gentleman and scholar as he was, failed to secure the Episcopate from the English bishops.

On the other hand, with the ecclesiastical elements in many quarters so indifferent and unintelligent that they could not be depended upon for the support of such measures as might be adopted, Dr. White had such control over the parishes in Pennsylvania, and took such a statesmanlike view of the situation, that he brought the Churchmen of that State into an organized condition, representing the Church in its integrity, before any effort was made to secure the Episcopate. Then there was something in a representative form to be depended upon when the first preliminary General Convention was called for at Philadelphia in 1785. It was Bishop

White's suggestion in his suppressed pamphlet, that the laity should be included jointly with the clergy in the efforts to organize the parishes into ecclesiastical jurisdictions coterminous with the several States. In all the New England jurisdictions the laity were at first rigidly excluded, though they were afterwards admitted. Bishop Moberly has seen fit to specially commend the American Church for going back to primitive usage in admitting the laity to a share in the organized life of the Church, and it was due to Dr. White's clear discernment of its necessity at that time for the wise organization of the American dioceses that the laity were associated with the clergy in ecclesiastical legislation. Probably he was quite as much influenced by the demands of common sense as by the claims of Catholic antiquity. The English Church had been from the beginning in this country so largely controlled by the influential laity that any other course would have been suicidal, and to his discernment of the real condition of things is mainly due the fact that the laity have been allowed to participate to an unprecedented degree in the direction of our ecclesiastical affairs.

It is not difficult to perceive two figures rising at this point into prominence in the organization and development of the American Church. Dr. White and Dr. Seabury before the Revolution were the leading clergymen in their respective fields of labour. It could not be said in truth that they differed widely in their Churchmanship. The difference was more in their way of meeting and dealing with ecclesiastical questions than in the divergence of their views of the truth.

After they became bishops, they were quickly recognized as not only leaders but champions of the faith. Bishop Seabury was confident, impulsive, aggressive. He made the Puritans sensible of his authority as an ecclesiastic, and no man was more a bishop than he when dressed in his robes of office. He was sensitive and zealous for every bit of prerogative and every part of the Catholic faith. In temperament Bishop White was his opposite. While always a man of dignity and reserve, he never insisted upon his prerogative as a bishop. Once at the roll-call of a society to which he belonged among the Quakers, his name was read as William White. Some one broke in upon the reader with the charge of disrespect toward the bishop, but he quickly interposed with the words, "I am perfectly contented with the name my mother gave me." He carried his ends without seeming to do so. His reserves were more remarkable than his utterances and gave him a silent power among men. He always took the sensible line of conduct; and if in a community where the forms and ceremonies of the Church were at a discount he adjusted himself to the sentiment of the people in presenting the claims of his own communion, it was not because he was a man indifferent to Church principles or without a firm belief in them himself, but because he felt profoundly convinced that it was better to carry the whole community with him for moderate views than to have the commendation of a part of it and the honest antagonism of the rest. The two men were the complement of one another, and when they came together as the first two members of the House

of Bishops, and sat on opposite sides of the table in Bishop White's study, after their early differences had been arranged, they were like Paul and Apollos working together for the increase of the kingdom of God.

The natural order of the narrative has been a little anticipated in order to obtain a certain perspective. It is time to turn back to the natural course of events in the organization of the American Church. The interest centres at this time in the wise steps by which Dr. White proceeded in securing a proper ecclesiastical organization. It was his aim to prepare for the choice of a bishop by the proper representatives of the Church. The first thing to do was to collect and unite its scattered members so that they might be a body over which a bishop could be placed when consecrated, and on whose authority he could depend in his application to the English bishops for consecration. The General Convention, which met in Philadelphia on the 27th of September, 1785, consisted of representatives from seven States, — New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. Dr. White was unanimously chosen president, and the Church was organized and united in these States under a provisional and general constitution, which was not finally ratified until the Convention of 1789. This gathering was of the first importance, because, under Dr. White's direction, it blocked out the course which was to be taken in the future in regard to the Episcopate, the constitution, the liturgy, the articles of religion, and the canons. The Convention entered on the business of the Episcopacy, with the knowledge



there was then a bishop in Connecticut, consecrated not in England but by the Non-Juring bishops of Scotland. Bishop Seabury had already begun the exercise of his new functions, early in the preceding summer, and two or three persons in the Southern States had received ordination at his hands. And yet, with no disrespect to the new bishop, the majority of the members of this Convention thought it most proper that they should obtain the Episcopate directly from the English Church.

The war was then so recent, and ecclesiastical and political affairs in England were so complicated, that this object had to be conducted with the greatest tact and delicacy, for fear that it would provoke opposition in England, and would be resented as an act by which the Episcopal Church intended to unduly assert itself in this country. However loyal to the new government its members then might be, the Church as a whole was in great disfavour in America because many of its clergy and laity had taken the Tory side during the Revolution. In nothing is the sagacity of Dr. White more distinctly seen than in the way in which he proceeded in disarming opposition in America to the request that the Episcopal succession should be obtained from the English bishops ; and a signal proof of it is that John Adams, a Puritan of strict type, was foremost in his efforts to forward this business when clergymen were sent to England to obtain Episcopal consecration. Such limited powers as this Convention possessed were put to service in the form of an address to the archbishops and bishops of England, asking

them to consecrate to the Episcopacy those persons who should be sent with that purpose in view from the churches in any of the States respectively. Dr. White prepared this address, and it was adopted substantially as he wrote it. It was received with friendly caution. The liturgy, as altered, and also the constitution then adopted, though sent to England, had not reached that country at the date of their reply to the address.

After the Convention had adjourned, the English bishops sent a second letter, in which they commented upon the omissions which had been made in the revision of the book of Common Prayer, and gave the promise that an act of Parliament would be passed by which the powers necessary for the proposed consecration would be granted by the State to the bishops for this purpose. A third letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury gave notice that this act had been passed, and that in their opinion in England only three bishops should be consecrated for the United States. Dr. White was unanimously elected bishop of Pennsylvania at a special convention, which was held on the 14th of September, 1786. Three only of the clergy of that State besides himself were present, though two clergymen belonging to it expressed their concurrence in the election later on. At about the same time the Rev. Mr. Provoost was elected bishop in New York. The adjourned General Convention met at Wilmington, Del., according to previous appointment, and signed the testimonials in favour of the two bishops-elect. They also took pains to satisfy the English prelates that

they had taken every possible care to maintain the same essential articles of faith and discipline which had been handed down in the Church of England. They restored the article, "He descended into hell" in the Apostles' Creed and inserted the Nicene Creed in the liturgy, but they refused to admit the Athanasian. Dr. White was the ruling spirit in all these deliberations, and the committee on the communications from the English bishops sat up all night to digest the measures which were adopted the next day in the Convention.

It will be seen from the account already given that Dr. White and Mr. Provoost were chosen bishops and were prepared to visit England for their consecration under far different auspices from those under which Dr. Seabury had proceeded three years earlier. The object was the same, but the preparation for it shows a different conception of the requirements of the Church from that which obtained in New England. Dr. White had laboured from the beginning of his larger responsibilities to unite the scattered congregations in the different Middle and Southern States, and his success in reaching this result was due to his knowledge of men and his intuitive good sense in knowing how far to go. Much fault has been found with the "Proposed Book." He led the way in liturgical changes which would have lowered the Episcopal Church in its early beginnings in this country to a point of practice in doctrine and discipline and worship which at the end of a century its members are thankful to have left forever behind; but though this revision of the Prayer-book in 1785 was

quickly superseded by a book in which there was a closer conformity to the Church of England, it was not so unwise a work as it has often since been represented to have been. In point of fact, Dr. Smith was the promoter of most of the ecclesiastical and doctrinal changes. In the Middle and Southern States there had to be much yielding to the environment, if the Episcopal Church in its independent form was to be organized at all. This latitudinarianism did not express the fulness of Dr. White's own convictions, but his eye was on the possibilities of securing a united and properly organized Church, and he trusted to the future to bring many things into the right shape, when he accepted a present statement of which he did not fully approve. Between the free and easy laity, who largely represented the Church in Virginia and Maryland, and who feared that the introduction of the bishop would greatly interfere with their habits of living, and the German and Quaker elements which largely represented the unorganized religious life in Pennsylvania, it was necessary for him to take a moderate and middle course, passing lightly over points which he deemed to be defective in order to secure other points which were vital. By thus proceeding with wise caution and with a mild enforcement of fundamental principles, he secured a practically united Church; where, if he had insisted upon all his convictions, it would have been impossible to secure and maintain a practical unity. The benefit of proceeding in this way was easily perceived when the bishops-elect proceeded to England and asked for consecration to the Episco-

pate. They had their credentials, and a feeble but organized Church was behind them and had already endorsed them. This was the secret of their speedy success in obtaining consecration, and it largely explains the cause of Dr. Seabury's rejection by the English bishops.

CHAPTER IV.

AN INDEPENDENT CHURCH IN AMERICA.

THE two bishops-elect embarked in the monthly packet for England on the 2d of November, 1786, and arrived at Falmouth on the 20th of the same month. On the 4th of February, 1787, their consecration took place in Lambeth Chapel. Toward the end of the month they sailed for New York, where they arrived on the 7th of April, and soon began the exercise of the Episcopal office in their respective dioceses. There was no lack of courtesies to Bishop Seabury during the time that other parts of the American Church were waiting to obtain the Episcopate in the English line. While the bishop and clergy of Connecticut did not like the complexion of the measures taken for the calling of a General Convention at Philadelphia in 1785, they invited several of the Southern clergy to a convention to be held in the summer of 1784 at New Haven. It is plainly confessed that there was a strong feeling on the part of Bishop Seabury that Dr. White was not caring for the prerogatives of the Church, and that he was lowering its standard to the level of the prejudices of the people among whom he lived. Dr. White easily understood this, and while he congratulated Bishop Seabury on his arrival home

and apologized for not coming to his convention, the clergy of Connecticut were invited in turn by the Philadelphia Churchmen to attend their General Convention. This Bishop Seabury also declined to do. Stiffness and courtesy were manifested on both sides.

Dr. White did not deny the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration, but he was determined not to take any step by which the completeness of the Episcopal succession in the English line might be impaired for the American Church. Directly after he had returned from England, it was proposed that he and Bishop Provoost should unite with Bishop Seabury in consecrating the Rev. Edward Bass, who had been elected bishop by the clergy of Massachusetts and New Hampshire ; but both of the bishops in the English line were opposed to this as unwise, and Bishop Provoost was even unwilling to recognize the validity of the Scotch succession. Bishop White was happily relieved from his embarrassment, before any action became necessary, by the consecration of Dr. Madison in England for Bishop of Virginia. There were now three bishops in America who had derived their Episcopate from the English succession.

The centripetal forces in the Church at this time were greater than the centrifugal. It was for the interest of Bishop Seabury and his party as much as it was for Bishop White and his party to put away their differences and come together, though Bishop Provoost could never forget that Bishop Seabury had been a Tory in the Revolution, and was irresistibly opposed to his Whig principles. He had been chosen bishop by churchmen

mostly belonging to this party in New York, and much of his failure to develop his diocese and secure the confidence of his clergy was attributed to this cause. The first time that the two prelates met was at an adjourned meeting of the General Convention, which was held in Philadelphia in September, 1789. Bishop Provoost was detained at home by illness, and only two bishops were present, Bishop Seabury and Bishop White. The first House of Bishops held its sessions in his own study, in the new house which had been built for him and completed while he was absent in England to obtain his consecration. It was located in Walnut street, and, though still complete in its outside form, is no longer used as a dwelling house. The rooms which Bishop White occupied as a study and bedroom are still kept in substantially the condition in which he used them a century ago. It was here that these two men, who had been for several years under constant temptation to misunderstand one another, contested over a study table the principles which should be maintained inviolate in the American Episcopal Church.

The two men were the complement of one another, the one prudent and wise, the other valiant and uncompromising in his principles, and only yielding where discretion seemed to be the better part of valour. Bishop Seabury was attended by two deputies from Connecticut and by the Rev. Samuel Parker, afterwards Bishop Parker, who represented the churches in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. A conference took place between them and a committee of the Convention, and the result was that after some modifications they signed the con-

stitution, and the union was completed. Bishop White afterwards wrote that Dr. Parker of Boston was largely influential in bringing about this harmonious arrangement. The clergy in that State, though still without a bishop, were equally free from the authority of men in England or Connecticut, and they had it in their power to act the part of mediators in bringing the clergy of Connecticut and those of other States together. It ought also to be said that Bishop Seabury, during the period in which his jurisdiction was not recognized beyond Connecticut, and also in these negotiations, conducted himself with the dignity and cordiality which belonged to his office ; and when he and Bishop White in the latter's study sat face to face, they were practically the guiding and restraining minds in the American Church. They were in the positions where each could render the highest service in its organization.

It is impossible to present Bishop White in his work as its founder and leader, without entering into detail on points of organization. The General Convention of 1789 was the first really authoritative gathering of American Churchmen. Though much which had been outlined in other meetings of the clergy and laity was practically adopted, it was not until this time that it was considered to have a binding force. The laity had, by Bishop White's devising, been admitted as equal representatives with the clergy in the Lower House from the beginning, but it was at this time that Bishop Seabury and the clergy of Connecticut consented with reluctance that the two orders should sit together in the same House. It was a notable event to admit the

laity into the Church Councils. It was secured by yielding to conquer. The rule had been that each State should have clerical and lay deputies in its diocesan convention. At the solicitation of the clergy of Connecticut this article of the constitution was omitted to suit their case. By allowing them the privilege of organizing the convention in their own State on the principles preferred by themselves, all opposition was disarmed, and the result was that in the General Convention of 1792 lay as well as clerical deputies appeared from that State, and their diocesan convention was then so ordered that lay deputies from the parishes were admitted to it.

The first consecration which took place in the United States was that of Dr. Claggett, as Bishop of Maryland, at the General Convention of 1792 in New York. Dr. Madison of Virginia had been consecrated by the English prelates in September, 1790. Bishop Provoost presided, and was assisted by Bishops White and Madison, and by Bishop Seabury, who for the first time exercised the highest gift of his Episcopal office. By this act all the suspicions which Bishop Seabury at times entertained, that the bishops in the English line intended to ignore his office were set aside, and from this time until his death in 1796 no one laboured more vigorously than he to secure the complete organization and the full development of the American Episcopal Church.

At first there was no House of Bishops, for the very good reason that the General Convention was organized before any bishops had been consecrated to constitute

such a House. There was very great jealousy of anything like Episcopal authority, and it was regarded in 1786 as a great point gained that the right of presiding was secured to the bishops. It was by this concession that Bishop White presided, as the senior bishop, in the Convention of 1789. But when there should be three bishops of the Church, it was provided that they should form a separate House, and that their power should be confined to the revision of the acts of the Lower House, which might, in case of their nonconcurrence, pass an act by a majority of three-fifths of that House. In this arrangement Bishop White took no part. The only point which Bishop Seabury insisted upon when the union took place, was that the Constitution should be so modified as to declare explicitly the right of the bishops, when sitting in a separate House, to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the other House, and to negative such acts proposed by that House as they might disapprove. This was boldly holding up the Episcopal authority; and had not a lay delegate from Virginia objected that it was a stretch of authority that the Church in Virginia would dissent from, it would have been accepted. It was not to be accomplished until the Convention of 1808, and Bishop Seabury and the New England deputies reluctantly acquiesced in a compromise which came short of what they thought that Episcopal government demanded.

Before the House of Bishops was created it was a permanent rule of order that in the General Convention "the senior bishop present should be the president, — seniority to be reckoned from the dates of the

letters of consecration." This made Bishop Seabury the first president of the house. In 1792 Bishops Provoost and Madison were dissatisfied with this rule. Bishop White believed that it was the correct principle, but to avoid any appearance of seeming to claim his right under the rule, he absented himself from the House on the morning when the matter was to come up, and the rule was then altered so that the bishops held the presidency in rotation. This made Dr. Provoost president in 1792, but in 1804 the former rule was again established, and Dr. White then became and continued to be the presiding bishop during the remainder of his life. Not only this, but he wrote and issued all the pastoral letters addressed to the whole Episcopal Church until 1836.

In the Convention of 1789 the Protestant Episcopal Church, essentially as we know it to-day, took its shape. The Prayer-book of the Church of England was used without alteration until the Fourth of July, 1776. On this day the vestry of Christ Church and St. Peter's, Philadelphia, directed the disuse by the clergy of the parish of the petitions wherein the King of Great Britain was prayed for. No other change took place until the Convention of 1785. It was then at first intended to make only the changes and the alterations which the civil changes required; but in this Convention it was soon found that much more ought to be done, and done in a different way from the liberal use of the pruning-knife shown in the "Proposed Book." The English bishops had been cautious to guard against these changes in favour of a lower standard of principles and devotion, and in 1789 the time had gone by when

the "Proposed Book" was acceptable even to the majority of American Churchmen. The revision of 1789 brought out a striking difference in the course adopted by the two Houses in the General Convention. The bishops held that the Church under another name was still the same body which existed before the Revolution, and was in possession of all the institutions that then existed. The other House proceeded as if the thing to do was to prepare offices that were absolutely new. As this course was confined to the Lower House, it did not have authority against the principle adopted by the bishops. Thus the revision of the liturgy was saved from the excesses to which many in the Lower House might have carried it. It fell to Bishop White, though he was not in favour of making a selection of the psalms in metre, as one of the bishops appointed on the committee, to aid in preparing the psalms and hymns in metre for use in the earlier days of the Church. At that time the idea prevailed largely that in appointing psalms and hymns and the metre to be used, heresy might be brought into the Church and cause a great deal of difficulty. The alterations in the ordination offices, on the review of them in 1792, were prepared by the bishops. Bishop White says, in his "Memoirs":—

"There was no material difference of opinion except in regard to the words used by the bishop at the ordination of priests, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' and, 'Whose sins thou doest forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou doest retain, they are retained.' Bishop Seabury, who alone was tenacious of this form, consented at last, with

great reluctance, to allow the alternative of another as it now stands.”¹

The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were then regarded as more important than they are now, and the English bishops were strenuous that they should be retained essentially in their integrity. This was the occasion of discussion in several conventions. Bishop Madison did not believe in having any articles of religion at all, and Bishop Provoost held the same opinion ; while Bishop Seabury, at first in doubt whether it was expedient to have any, was afterwards strongly convinced that they should be retained. Bishop Claggett was in favour of them ; Bishop White also professed himself an advocate for articles ; but they were not finally established as documents of authority until the Convention of 1801. Bishop White did not consider them the best rule of faith that could be devised, but he thought that they were better than any others likely to be obtained under present circumstances. The members of the General Convention in that day were not equal to entering upon determinations of such magnitude.

It was a different work that came before the Convention of 1789 when it entered upon the framing of a code of canons for the regulation of the Church. Bishop White's experience and learning and judgment were of signal use in forming and improving it. It was a work which had to be undertaken almost entirely afresh. The Church of England supplied many excel-

¹ Third edition, p. 191.

lent principles in its canons, but the situation of the two Churches was so different that very few of the English canons could be adopted in the United States. Bishop White was prominent in all the canonical legislation of the Church, usually the chairman of the committee that had the work in hand, and it was not until 1832 that a wise and well-matured body of canons was established by the General Convention. His part in regulating the judicial functions was not a consequence of his rank as presiding bishop ; but it was accorded to him out of respect for himself personally, and of confidence in his skill, experience, and impartiality.

While the Convention of 1789 did not complete the organization of every detail in the polity and discipline and worship of the Episcopal Church, all its leading principles were practically established and in force when it adjourned. Speaking generally, it could be said that the new Anglican communion in America had completed its outfit and was in proper working order.

It is interesting for a moment to compare this work of organization with that which proceeded at the same time in the Roman Catholic Church under the lead of Dr. Carroll, who was at first a missionary priest in Maryland, then an Apostolic Prefect, and who was finally chosen by the Roman priests in Maryland as the first Bishop of Baltimore. This took place in 1789. He was consecrated in Lulworth, England, by the Right Rev. Charles Walmesley, then senior Vicar-Apostolic of England, on the feast of Assumption, August 15, 1790. All the time that Bishop White was preparing the way for the organization of the Anglican

churches established in America under the complete control and direction of the Episcopacy, Dr. Carroll, established at Baltimore, and occupying a similar position, as the foremost Roman priest in the United States, was urging that the Roman Catholics, both clergy and laity, might be placed under a diocesan bishop, who should bring the entire Roman Catholic communion in the United States within proper ecclesiastical direction. Between Bishop White and Bishop Carroll, though they were never intimate with one another, there was much in the circumstances of their ecclesiastical work that was similar. Both had to proceed with great caution lest they should arouse political animosity; both were placed in situations where the oversight of the churches at large was almost forced upon them before they had the right to act with authority; both were modest men, not given to self-seeking, but brought into prominence because of their recognized fitness for the work which they were appointed to do; and both were supremely devoted to the great purpose of organizing their respective bodies upon a true and right historical basis. It was given to Archbishop Carroll to live until the autumn of 1815, and during the thirty-five years in which he was the foremost Roman Catholic prelate in the United States, he made his Church in this country a compact, influential, and progressive body. Bishop White survived Archbishop Carroll more than twenty years, but the great work of his life was completed when the American Episcopal Church had been developed into a good working organization. There were many other things for which

he was distinguished in the future development of the Episcopal Church, the outgrowth of his commanding influence in its early shaping ; but these were the natural outgrowth of his position, and the further evidence of his wise and statesmanlike qualities.

CHAPTER V.

PHILADELPHIA A CENTURY AGO.

IN 1790, when the national government was removed from New York to Philadelphia, the latter was the wealthiest and largest city in the country. It then contained about seventy thousand inhabitants, and represented a Swedish, German, Irish, and English population. Philadelphia was at that time the only place of importance in Pennsylvania. Some settlements were established in the neighbourhood, but in very few of them were there enough people of any one religious faith to support a clergyman. At this time there were only three or four Episcopal Churches in Philadelphia itself, but they included then, as now, a large portion of the people of wealth and refinement and position. The choice of the city as the location of the national government during the administration of Washington gave it a fresh impulse, and the inhabitants submitted to heavy taxes upon their resources to meet the new conditions. With comparatively few exceptions, there were no people of wealth in the American States. Washington and Bishop White were at that time two of the wealthiest men in the country, and perhaps the two who had the least desire to make a

display of it or to exact any deference on account of it from their fellow citizens.

When Washington came to Philadelphia a presidential mansion was procured for him by the citizens at great expense ; but he declined to live in it, and hired a house at \$3,000 a year of Robert Morris, the brother-in-law of Bishop White, near the corner of High and Sixth streets, where he could live with the plainness and simplicity which he felt to be most becoming in an American citizen who was setting an example for the nation. The gentry in Philadelphia made the most of the government socially, and imitated as far as they could the court habits of London and Paris in dress and equipage and manners. The lines between them and the traders and the common people were very sharply drawn. None but the gentry were expected to wear calfskin shoes ; there were but few four-wheel carriages, and Washington in his coach drawn by six horses was the only person in the nation who was expected to support such a style, and it was out of respect to his office as President, not from any private wishes, that he maintained it. Dignity and moderation were observable in all that he did, — in his social entertainments, in his personal bearing, and in his public relations.

Bishop White, who then virtually stood forth as the first person in the Episcopal Church in North America, was in Philadelphia only second in prominence and position to President Washington. The two men were in close and confidential relations. The Bishop was constantly invited to be present at the dinners of state

given by Washington, and his residence on Walnut street was the only place where the President and his wife allowed themselves to make a social call. Bishop White was a Federalist, and a man of strong political convictions, which he did not hesitate to express whenever the occasion called for it. When Dr. White was appointed chaplain of the Continental Congress his brother-in-law said, "If he accepts it," he drew his hand across his throat and added, "he will be hung." This did not in the least deter him from doing what he thought to be his duty. The intimacy between him and Washington was all the greater because they were limited in their spheres of action. One could not interfere with the other. Then, too, the relation was that of a parishioner to his pastor. Bishop White retained the rectorship of Christ and St. Peter's churches to the day of his death. He was in his prime when Robert Morris occupied the pew next to the pulpit in old Christ Church, and when Washington sat in the pew next to him and used to drive up through the archway and enter the edifice by the side door. Benjamin Franklin and Francis Hopkinson were also parishioners at that time, and the beautiful chimes and the mitre on the spire and the modest elegance of the building made it the most conspicuous and notable place of worship in the city. Alexander Hamilton must have often been a worshipper at that time, and the Governor of Pennsylvania had his official pew in the gallery near to the chancel. The place was already notable for what had taken place in it. In the vestry Seabury and White had revised the Communion Office

in 1789, introducing the prayer of consecration from the Scotch ritual without which Bishop Seabury would not call it faithful to the principles of the Catholic faith, and which Dr. William Smith read so well to the General Convention assembled in the church, of which he was president, that they accepted it without any hesitation. Here the cares and anxieties of state were forgotten by the leaders of the new government, while they assembled under the direction of Bishop White to worship the Lord of the whole earth; and here the piety and the fashion of the first city in the land found devout and congenial expression.

Washington was not himself a communicant of the Church, though his wife was a devout and constant receiver of the sacraments. He was a deeply religious man, and at his own table, in the absence of a clergyman, always said grace standing. He never allowed religious discussion, or at least never indulged in it himself, and neither he nor Bishop White ever broke the reserve in which they treated matters of personal religion. To each of them religion in the inner life was something sacred and to be treated with great reserve. This did not mean the absence of devotion or any want of thoughtfulness in these matters. It indicated that in an age of cant there were two persons, high in office and foremost citizens of a great nation, who had the courage to set an example of the highest meaning to others in their expression of the relations of the soul to God. The reserve which both maintained in their religious life was characteristic of them to a great extent in all their intercourse with their fel-

lowmen. This does not mean that they were always grave and serious. They knew how to be affable and communicative to others, but beyond their family ties neither of them had many correspondents to whom they wrote freely about the things in which they were interested. For this reason, the lives of each have to be treated largely from the outside. It is what they were engaged in and the way in which they met their duties and the spirit which they brought into life that chiefly interest us. There are no asides, no looking into the inner man, no hours of agony or moments of triumph, and the biographer of both is obliged to resort to special methods for presenting them not only in the spirit in which they discharged the duties of public office but in the freedom of private life.

Such men give their strength to mankind, to the causes and interests through which the world advances. It will not be amiss if the reader is asked to compare the situations of these two men in their positions in the State and in the Church. There was no connection between the two institutions, but each was new in its organization and each demanded men of nerve, silence, and courage at the head of affairs. Washington was then in the height of his career. The man who had been aptly called "the Father of his country" had been elected to be the head of the new government. The Constitution had been accepted in the different States with difficulty, if not resisted, and people were in constant danger of forgetting what the Revolution had cost, and what the nation stood for as a whole. There were two views of the way in which the country

should be governed, the Federal view, and the Republican, or, as it came to be later, the Democratic view. It was either a government which had central power enough to compel obedience to its principles, or a government which could only be the expression of the political principles of the sovereign States. Washington could take but one view of the situation. He had fought for the whole country, and had made greater sacrifices for its independence and its unity than any other citizen.

It was his privilege and his duty to stand up for unity of action, and for the principles which Hamilton and Madison had put forth in the "Federalist." There was, however, a strong and jealous feeling among many men, of whom Jefferson was the leader, that the encroachments of Federal power must be resisted and repressed at every step. This made the government bitterly partisan from the beginning, and much as Washington was beloved and revered by the people nothing too bitter could be said against him by the politicians. He realized while President the truth of the words that a prophet is not without honour save in his own country and among his own kith and kin. This did not cause him to swerve from duty, but it made his position irksome and wearying to one who preferred his quiet life at Mount Vernon before all the emoluments of high station. The following anecdote concerning Washington is related by the Bishop : —

"On the day before his leaving of the Presidential chair a large company dined with him. Among them were the foreign ministers and their ladies, Mr. and Mrs. Adams,

Mr. Jefferson, with other conspicuous persons of both sexes, During the dinner much hilarity prevailed, but on the removal of the cloth it was put an end to by the President, certainly without design. Having filled his glass, he addressed the company with a smile on his countenance, as nearly as can be recollected, in the following terms: 'Ladies and gentlemen, this is the last time I shall drink your health as a public man. I do it with sincerity, and wishing you all possible happiness.' There was an end of all pleasantry. He who gives this relation accidentally directed his eye to the lady of the British minister, Mrs. Liston, and tears were running down her cheeks." ¹

Within a few days before his second term expired the vestry of Christ Church waited on him with an address prepared and delivered by the Bishop, to which he answered that he had been gratified by what he had heard from that pulpit, but he committed himself to nothing more.

Bishop White had a more limited sphere to work in than Washington had. It was entirely ecclesiastical, but it had many points of likeness with the new political regime. The situation has already been described. The feebleness of the churches after the Revolution was great. Outside of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia hardly one was self-supporting. When the aid of the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was withdrawn at the end of the war, not only were many of the clergy either dead or living elsewhere, but the parishes were in a weak and helpless condition, and none of them appreciated, or had

¹ Dr. Wilson's Memoir, p. 192.

ever known by experience, the advantage of working together. It was as difficult for Bishop White to bring these unrelated congregations together as it was for Washington and Franklin to persuade the thirteen original States to act in concert. The same sort of quiet and calm statesmanship required in the one case was needed in the other. It was with the utmost difficulty that Bishop White persuaded the imperious Seabury to concede some of his strong and justifiable positions as a Churchman, while it was even more difficult for him to deal with the clergy and laity in many quarters, who feared that, if the Church were properly organized under the bishops, they would be deprived of their freedom of living as they pleased. It was nothing short of the firmness and determination, which are often concealed under the forms of gentleness and the seeming to yield, that enabled Bishop White to gather the scattered fragments of the American Church at that time to a point where the clergy and laity were willing to act together. The years of greatest weakness in the Episcopal Church were precisely the years during which the American nation passed through at Philadelphia its trysting period under President Washington.

CHAPTER VI.

BISHOP WHITE AS A MAN.

FROM the year 1770 when Mrs. White records that on April 12th she "let Billy have to pay the Hebrew master £1," and that on May 11th she let Billy have another £1 for the same purpose, her son may be said to have found his vocation ; and he never lost it. One would have picked Bishop White out on the streets, although a perfect stranger to him, as an ecclesiastic. He was over six feet in height ; in early life he had a ruddy face and full cheeks, but in later years was always something less than fleshy, though a man of hardy and robust constitution. He was never sick a day in his life until he took his bed in his eighty-ninth year to die, and then the end was simply the winding up of life on account of old age. His height was largely due to his long legs, which were always covered up to the knees with black silk stockings ; and when friends remonstrated with him in his old age that the calves of his legs were not as full as they once were, he still declined to alter his style of dress. At home he always wore in summer a silk dressing-gown ; in the winter he put on a camlet cloak whenever he went out. He made his own fire up to the last of his life, and was regular and methodical in his habits. He never went

out of town in summer. In his younger days he was spoken of as being very handsome ; and a woman once said to a relative of his, when the Bishop was preaching during an evening service at Christ Church, "Becky, come out at once to church ; your cousin is in the pulpit and looks like an angel !"

The Bishop was a hearty eater, and liked good things. He was fond of mince-pies, and used to butter them. In fact, he treated his bread as if it were furnished him for the sake of the butter that might be consumed with it. Old Dr. Chapman used to say to him : "I believe if you could swallow ten-penny nails you would digest them." His love of good food was the secret of his long life, but one of his habits was anything but temperate. He liked green tea, as black as lye, and insisted on having it. It must be as strong as it could be made. At his home there was scarcely a meal at which he did not have a guest, though he never knew what it was to spend his time with boon companions. He always dined at two o'clock. He drank two glasses of wine, and never went beyond this limit, at this meal ; he used to smoke one or two cigars after dinner. The early death of his wife in 1779 did not break up his home, which was lovingly cared for by members of his family until his oldest daughter was able to take charge of it ; and he found in the society of his children and that of his grandchildren much of the solace and recreation of his life. He used to spend most of his time in his study, but after nine o'clock in the evening he always came downstairs for an hour with the family. He liked to have his grand-

children dance, though he would never allow them to waltz. He used to smoke a solitary cigar, drink one glass of sherry, and eat two roasted apples every night before retiring. One of his family says: "The only way we could tell that he was not well was when he left off his cigar. He delighted in the evening to have his grandchildren rub his hair behind his ears, which he called teaseling, and to rub his silk stockings before a hot open fire. He never wore a wig, as the fashion was, but powdered his hair." One of his friends, a lady often in his company, picked up every hair that fell from his long locks, and finally collected, unknown to him, quite a good-sized lock of his hair. This shows how he was venerated. He was not only liked by his own Church people, but beloved by all denominations. He was always spoken of as "Our Bishop."

He never asserted himself in conversation. He bore himself with a quiet dignity. In this respect he contrasted sharply with Bishop Seabury, who had naturally an aggressive and confident manner. In the early days of the Church he was in favour of introducing what would now be called the provincial system; but he was strongly opposed to the creation of an archbishopric, though he would most likely have been appointed archbishop, had the arrangement of provinces been introduced. Dr. Bird Wilson says:—

"In his intercourse with his family and relatives he manifested an affection tender, constant, and judicious; and he received from all of them the reverence and attachment so justly due. His general social intercourse was distinguished by benevolence and urbanity, flowing from a

heart disposed to promote the happiness and gratification of all around him. With these he possessed a delicacy of feeling which made him instinctively shrink from anything that might wound the feelings of others. His society was sought by old and young, and by each sex. His conversation, in which he readily and freely engaged and took pleasure, was cheerful, animated and full of anecdotes relating to interesting scenes which he had himself beheld at different periods of his life, and to the numerous persons of distinction with whom he had formerly been acquainted. For his memory was retentive and accurate : not only with respect to facts occurring in early life, which is not uncommon in aged men ; but also to those of more recent occurrence, which is more unusual.

“Religion was readily made the topic of conversation whenever an occasion offered appearing to promise good from the introduction of its truths. But it was contrary to his principles, and thought by him injudicious and seldom productive of beneficial results, to press them constantly into notice, without regard to suitable opportunities. The deportment of all towards him was easy and unrestrained, but respectful and affectionate ; the dignity of his character and manners repressing any approach to undue familiarity. With all this mildness and suavity he could, when the occasion demanded, reprove with severity, — with great skill, in consequence of his correct knowledge and judgment of the principles of human nature, and with much efficacy, either by words, or by marked silence and disapprobation, or other indications of his sentiments. Such a deportment and such dispositions and character attracted, as they were naturally adapted to do, the friendship and affection of all who knew him. No man, probably, could be more free than he was from experiencing the enmity of others, or more remote from enmity to them. It was remarked that he had no enemies, and was well spoken of by all ; and for this last reason his friend and intimate, Dr. Benjamin Rush,

denounced against him (humorously) the woe pronounced in the Gospel, because all men spake well of him !

“ He thought it not inconsistent with his sacred office to be present at and partake of the public dinners on anniversary festivals or other celebrations. I was once informed by him, in the course of a conversation at a late period of his life, of his reasons for so doing. He believed it called for by his public station ; that it tended to check improprieties, and also led to opportunities of usefulness which he should not otherwise have obtained. But he early formed a resolution that if he lived to the age of seventy he should consider himself at liberty to decline them. To this resolution he accordingly afterwards adhered.

“ Towards Christians of other denominations Dr. White was tolerant and liberal ; and with many of them he sustained a friendly and intimate intercourse. This did not require any sacrifice of religious truth, or disregard or neglect of the interests of his own Church ; nor was he capable of either. His moderation did not proceed from indifference. He was firm in maintaining what he deemed religious truth, and in an enlightened attachment to the Episcopal Church. Both in these respects, and in the course pursued by him in the affairs of his own Communion, moderation and firmness harmonized in an unusual degree ; though it might sometimes be thought that they apparently interfered ; only, however, in cases in which he avoided pressing an approved principle, because he thought the occasion unfavourable, and expected that one more propitious would occur. He felt and showed a proper deference and respect for the opinions of others ; and was deliberate and cautious in forming his own ; but when once formed, they were steadily adhered to and acted upon.

“ The mildness and candour of the Bishop’s disposition were strikingly illustrated by the spirit prevailing in his controversial writings. These were wholly free from the

least infusion of animosity, bitterness, sarcasm, or unfairness in the statement of the opinions or motives of adversaries, by which such writings are too generally distinguished. Probably they may be less pleasing to many readers for the want of those properties; some of which, at least, are thought to add to the animation and interest of controversy. But they are more honourable to his character and Christian feelings; the more so, because theological controversy is so apt to excite unfriendly and violent emotions even in those who, on all other occasions, manifest a truly Christian temper. Candour, urbanity, and the love of truth are preserved throughout his works. The support of sound and correct principles, and not victory or the display of intellectual ability or learning, was his uniform object, — which he sought to attain by just argument, without resort to misrepresentation or invective.

“Modesty and humility appeared in his whole life and conversation, in his deportment in every station. Possessed of an unusual degree of personal influence, and of acknowledged eminence, he was perfectly unassuming, and apparently unconscious, certainly unostentatious, of both. Both also were received unsought; and both were probably much increased by this very cause. He even felt pain at receiving compliments on his own usefulness or attainments; though they were not designed merely as such, or uttered in his presence, but expressed with sincerity and truth in letters or publications. As a specimen of this may be adduced the following remark in a letter to Bishop Hobart [10th of August, 1808], who had, in a review of his Episcopal charge of 1807, spoken highly of his theological learning and abilities: ‘As a reviewer I think you too long in your extracts from my charge. If you go on so, it will take up too much of your room. I take well your gentle castigations; which I could answer, but have not time. It gave me less concern than the stroking which preceded. Be assured I felt a painful sensation on reading of my “ex-

tensive and deep theological erudition ;” for, if I thought myself, as I do not, possessed of talents for it, circumstances have not permitted my being enough in my study for the acquisition.’ To these estimable features may be added great innocency and purity of mind and manners, shining forth in his whole deportment, as if he were unconscious of evil.

“His conduct in every situation, even the most unexpected and trying, evinced distinguished Christian prudence. This virtue had full scope for exercise and probation, in the various situations in which he was from time to time placed, by the incidents connected with the government and affairs of the Church over which he presided, and by his frequent intercourse with those of other denominations. By it he was enabled, without abandoning any principle deemed correct by himself or his own Church, to preserve harmony of feeling and intercourse with others, and obtain their respect and friendship. And an intellectual quality, possessed by him in a very eminent degree, and improved by close observation and experience, contributed largely to the good results of that prudence, and to the increase of his usefulness to the Church, — I mean his accurate discrimination of the characters of men, in which he was seldom mistaken when he had reasonable opportunities of forming a judgment. He was not hasty or rash in adopting his opinion, or disposed to entertain prejudices, or to persevere in a mistaken judgment. The most perfect candour towards all was his aim and desire.

“Being placed in a very extensive parish, as well as in a large diocese, his active duties were numerous and arduous, and necessarily occupied much of his time. Yet he was enabled to devote much time also to the labours of his study. It has often excited surprise that he was able to effect so much. But the causes were his great and unintermitted industry ; his exact method in the employment of his time ; his strict punctuality in complying with every engagement

(for which he was remarkable, and often produced the like habit in those with whom he had intercourse in business); the ease with which he could fix his mind intently on the subject before him; and the clearness and rapidity of his conception. These habits and powers continued unimpaired until his last illness.

“In relieving distress, and in other exercises of charity, he was benevolent and liberal. Yet his revenues were not large; his family became numerous; and his station exposed him to many unavoidable expenses. His income from his parish was about twenty-two or twenty-three hundred dollars. As bishop he received nothing except the interest on Mr. Andrew Doz’s legacy, of about four thousand dollars, which was the first foundation of the Episcopal fund of the diocese; and he was frequently obliged to defray himself the expense of visiting different churches. He had however a respectable, but not large, private estate. The mention of this subject suggests the introduction of a remark made in a daily publication in Philadelphia, shortly after his death. Referring to the notice in the London papers of that event, and of the comparative mediocrity of his salary, the editor said: ‘Bishop White enjoyed a revenue beyond a monarch’s command; his daily income was beyond human computation. If he went forth, age paid the tribute of affectionate respect, and children “rose up and called him blessed.”’ The general sentiment applauded and concurred with the just and beautiful commendation.”¹

There is yet more to be said of his characteristics as a man. His manner to inferior people was that of a gentleman of the old school. He always took off his hat to them, when they took off their hats to him. His grandson once said to him: “Why do you do

¹ Dr. Wilson’s Memoir, pp. 276–283.

this?" "My child, would you have them polite to me, and I not to them?" Mr. John Sergeant said: "There will never be but one Bishop of Pennsylvania who will be known as the Bishop." Mr. Robert Walsh was at his house every day, and used to keep him well informed in all political matters. He was deeply interested in politics, always voted, and would stand in line waiting for his turn. His presence there had a salutary influence. Once he went with his dignified step to the polls and found them manned by a disputing multitude, fighting for access to the window. The moment it was whispered, "Bishop White is coming," a lane was opened by the contending factions, and the venerable prelate walked through and deposited his vote; the cessation of action continued until he had repassed the lines, and the result on the crowd was striking and beneficial for a considerable length of time. He was alive to all that was going on in his country and in Philadelphia, and he kept up this interest until his old age. He used a carriage until late in life, and had the front seat taken out of it in order to give his legs, which were unduly long, ample room. He was an early riser, usually getting up before any one else in the family. He persisted in preaching down to the very last of his life. When a parishioner offered him his sympathy in trying to preach in his old age, saying, "Is n't it hard for you to preach?" he replied: "Oh, no; the trouble is with your ears!" He was much with Benjamin Franklin, and Franklin's daughter, at her father's request, gave him the American Prayer-book for which Franklin wrote a preface.

Every man, woman, and child paid attention to the Bishop as if he belonged to them, and he could never walk through the streets without constant interruption from the people who insisted upon showing him their respect. He never minded the weather, and he led a very regular life. He was frequently invited to the city dancing assemblies, though he never participated in them. Up to seventy years of age, he used to go to dinner parties ; then he stopped and said : "The old man has done his duty." He was always to be found in his study, where he usually spent his mornings, with a book on his lap. He wrote his sermons standing up, in a large, clear, and scholar's hand. One can read them even to-day almost as easily as if they were in type. His literary industry was something remarkable. There was only one important work of his which was not published during his lifetime, and of this he said : "If anything is ever published after my death, I would rather have the answer to Barclay's *Apology* brought out than anything else." The reason why this work has never been brought out is not that it is not a valuable treatise, — something in the style of Hooker's "*Ecclesiastical Polity*," — but that the Quakers, against whose religious views it was written, have so far declined in numbers and in importance, that it would be to-day simply of historical value. Bishop White had to suffer a great deal from the importunity of the extremists of his time. If he had one application to take the temperance pledge, he had five hundred. His reply was that he had taken this pledge two or three times in his religious vows, and that he

did not see why he should take it again. He held that when a Christian man had promised to keep his body in soberness, temperance, and chastity, he had gone as far as language permitted him to go.

It is not difficult from these fragmentary reminiscences of his personality to draw the inference that "he was more of a gentleman than any of his people ;" and that he illustrated, as Washington did, the highest style of what an American citizen ought to be in the early days of our existence as a nation. His appearance as a Bishop was dignified and striking. The Episcopal robes became him greatly. This is seen in the portrait of him by Gilbert Stuart, as well as in the Inman portrait which represents the Bishop in his old age. He liked to preach, and during his long rectorship of Christ Church and St. Peter's he was always in his pulpit in one of these churches every Sunday morning. In making his visitations as Bishop he always preached to the congregation, and then gave a short address to the candidates whom he had confirmed.

Among the first persons to receive confirmation after his consecration were his wife and children. This took place at St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, Nov. 10, 1787, when he held his first confirmation, and administered the rite to forty-four persons. A month later, in the same year, he confirmed thirty-five persons in the same church. In Trinity parish, Oxford, in 1788, notable as the first charge of Bishop Hobart, who was born in Philadelphia and educated for the ministry under Bishop White, he confirmed forty-three. In 1805, on the 13th of May, sixty-one were confirmed at

St. Paul's; and on the 30th of May in the same year sixty-nine at St. Thomas's, Philadelphia. The largest class ever presented to him was at Trinity Church, Swedesborough, when two hundred and thirty-three persons were confirmed at one time. Again, on the 28th of March, 1812, one hundred and seventy-five were presented to him at St. Peter's on Easter eve, and at Christ Church on the 13th of April, 1811, being Easter eve, he confirmed one hundred and forty-nine persons. Again, at St. James's, Philadelphia, on the 17th of April, 1813, at Easter eve, the number rose to one hundred and fifty-one persons. Still further down the list, the record is made that at Trinity Church, Wilmington, on the 10th of October, 1819, one hundred and eleven were confirmed; and as late as 1825, at the visitation of Trinity parish, Pittsburgh, in the month of June, one hundred and thirty-five persons received this rite. These were among his largest classes, though as late as the 28th of March, 1836, a class of forty-eight was presented to him in his own parish, at Christ Church. His last confirmation was held on the 15th of May, in the same year, at St. Andrew's parish, where a class of forty-four was received.

These statements are given in order to indicate the state of the Church at that time. At one of Bishop Seabury's visitations in Connecticut the largest confirmation on record took place,—four hundred and seventy-six persons were confirmed at one time. In this instance persons came from several neighbouring parishes, and it was soon after Bishop Seabury's conse-

cration, when, as was often the case, nearly the whole congregation received the rite as the complement of what they had a right to ask from the Church and had been unable to obtain. Often there were persons who objected to receiving confirmation when they had been communicants all their lives, and among these was Bishop White's own mother, who could not be made to see that submission to this rite, even at her son's hands, was necessary in her old age. Bishop White confirmed each person separately, and always at one sentence in the confirmation office his voice broke and he could not control his emotion. In the service for the consecration of bishops, at the words, "Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf," his voice broke in the same way; and he could never read the parable of the prodigal son without betraying a similar sensibility.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DAY OF SMALL BEGINNINGS.

No other religious body in North America had the antecedents of the Episcopal Church during the colonial period, or had a more unpromising outlook at the close of the eighteenth century, or had more to contend with in the way of growth. Even Archbishop Carroll, who had a similar work of gathering up fragments and welding them into a proper organization, had in some respects less to contend with. After the churches had been united in their new organization and the Episcopate had been secured, the whole company North and South, along the Atlantic seaboard, would not have made a respectable American diocese in point of wealth or numbers, although the personal influence of Churchmen in those days was great on account of their political and social standing. In many of the parishes the people ranked among the foremost families of the country. This was the case especially in New York and Newport and Boston, where one of the two strongest parishes, — King's Chapel, — the earliest Episcopal organization in Boston, had become alienated by adopting the Unitarian principles of belief, and had withdrawn its influence from the weak and struggling Church. Parishes were established at Marblehead,

Salem, Newburyport, and Portsmouth. The foundation known as Trinity Parish, New York, gave the Episcopal Church great social and financial strength in that city. After New York there was almost nothing until Philadelphia was reached, and here the chief strength was confined to three or four parishes. In Maryland there was some strength in Baltimore and in Annapolis, and in Virginia there were many old churches in country districts, some of them in a decayed condition, many of them without pastors, and all of them deprived of their glebe lands, which had been used before the Revolution for the support of the clergy. In North and South Carolina there was some strength, but though the churches were Episcopal in name, the people were only willing to have a Bishop among them on the condition that he should not discharge the duties of his office.

The sympathy between these scattered congregations along the seaboard was not at all that of an active propaganda. It was all that each parish could do to hold its own. In the northern section, outside of the cities, the parishes had been largely assisted before the Revolution by the grants of the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. With the independence of the American States these grants were withdrawn. At no time could they have ceased with greater injury to these struggling congregations. Archbishop Carroll complains that in his own communion there were no funds to do anything with. The Episcopal parishes were in the same situation. Bishop Seabury was still a parish clergyman at New London after he had en-

tered upon his Episcopate, and his Episcopal income was confined to the payment of his travelling expenses as he journeyed from parish to parish. Bishop Provoost was a man of wealth, and also had the rectorship of the leading parish in New York. Bishop White, as has been already said, was also a man of wealth, and never received a dollar of income as Bishop during his long Episcopate. Bishop Madison left the presidency of the College of William and Mary to take the charge of the churches in Virginia, but no provision was made for his support while discharging the duties of his office, and the reason why Dr. Griffiths did not go to England to receive consecration with Dr. White and Dr. Provoost was that he was too poor to bear the expenses of the journey. This expense, according to Bishop White's accounts, was £350.¹ The poverty of the Episcopal churches in those days was real and great. The clergy were obliged to eke out their incomes by taking private pupils, and in many places it was with difficulty that the congregations were held together at all.

In New England most of the clergy had been loyal to the King during the Revolution, and the political hostility of the Puritans and of their descendants was added to the religious prejudice against them, which had been one of the traditions brought over from England in the great emigration of 1640. It is impossible at this time to appreciate the severity or intensity of the feeling which was entertained toward Churchmen

¹ This included the expense of his robes.

at the beginning of the century in all parts of New England. The austerities of the religious life were cultivated at the expense of its amenities. No courtesies were wasted between the Church rectors and their clerical neighbors. Most of the Church people were converts from the Puritan faith, and only in places like Newport and Boston and New York were there to be found persons who represented to any extent the colonial traditions and family life of the Episcopal Church. Trinity Parish, New York, had a certain prestige on account of its endowments, but the Dutch Reformed people and the Presbyterians gave a wide berth to its members in their social and religious intercourse. The conciliatory course of Bishop White had done much to create a kindly feeling among the Quakers. He had been careful not to antagonize their peculiar tenets, and yet he was the foremost man among Churchmen to recognize the need of organization and to insist on the proper foundations for future growth. The Church in Philadelphia advanced more rapidly from 1790 to 1800 than it did at any other point during that time along the Atlantic coast, and it is this fact which gave the Episcopal Church a precedence and position that have been retained up to the present time in that city.

In 1791 Bishop White had a communication from Dr. Thomas Coke, an Oxford graduate and a presbyter of the Church of England, who for fourteen years had been following John Wesley, and who, like him, did not intend to promote a separation of the Methodists from the Church of England. He wrote first to Bishop White, about two months after Wesley's death,

and then three weeks later, May 14, 1791, to Bishop Seabury, proposing in a confidential way measures for the union of Methodists in this country with the Episcopal Church. He evidently felt that he had no authority adequate to his office as an overseer or bishop in the Church of God. His actual feeling is expressed in the following extract from his letter to Bishop Seabury : —

“I love the Methodists in America and could not think of leaving them entirely, whatever might happen to me in Europe. The preachers and people also love me; many have a peculiar regard for me. But I could not with propriety visit American Methodists, possessing in our Church on this side of the water an office inferior to that of Mr Asbury. But if the two Houses of the Convention of the Clergy [meaning the General Convention] would consent to your consecration of Mr. Asbury and me as bishops of the Methodist Society in the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States, or by any other title, if that be not proper, on the supposition of the reunion of the two churches under proper mutual stipulations, and engage that the Methodist Societies shall have a regular supply, on the death of their bishops, and so on, *ad perpetuum*, the grand difficulty in respect to the teachers would be removed — they would have the same men to confide in whom they have at present, and all other mutual stipulations would soon be settled.”

It is not known that Bishop Seabury sent any reply to this letter, but Bishop White returned an answer.

Bishop Madison had the design of securing a union with the Methodists very much at heart, and introduced a proposition into the House of Bishops in 1792 which was intended to bring about some sort of union

between the two bodies. The proposition read as follows : —

“The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, ever bearing in mind the sacred obligation which attends all the followers of Christ to avoid divisions among themselves and anxious to promote that union for which our Lord and Saviour so earnestly prayed, do hereby declare to the Christian world, that, uninfluenced by any other considerations than those of duty as Christians and an earnest desire for the prosperity of true Christianity and the furtherance of our holy religion, they are ready and willing to unite and form one body with any religious society which shall be influenced by the same Catholic spirit. And in order that this Christian end may be the more easily effected, they further declare that all things in which the great essentials of Christianity or the characteristic principles of their Church are not concerned, they are willing to leave to future discussion; being ready to alter or modify those points which, in the opinion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, are subject to human alteration. And it is hereby recommended to the State Conventions to adopt such measures or to propose such conferences with Christians of other denominations as to themselves may be thought most prudent, and report accordingly to the ensuing General Convention.”

This plan was considered as preposterous by the Lower House. The clerical and lay deputies would not entertain it for a moment, and the Bishops asked leave to silently withdraw it. Bishop White saw Dr. Coke three times, and heard him read the letter which he had written to Bishop Seabury. Dr. Coke did not propose that the two bodies should be affiliated. His only expectation was that he and Mr. Asbury would become Bishops of the Methodist Society.

Bishop White remarks that "it was evident that from some circumstances which passed in conversation with Dr. Coke, there was a degree of jealousy, if not of misunderstanding, between him and Mr. Asbury;" and it is not known that the latter desired the Episcopal office. When Dr. White went to England for his consecration, he attempted to see Mr. Wesley in order to state to him some facts about the relation of the Methodist societies in America to the Episcopal Church, but his stay was so short that he was unable to obtain an interview. He had a conversation, however, with his brother, the Rev. Charles Wesley, who expressed himself in strong terms against the secession of the Methodists from the Church of England. The object of Dr. Coke seems to have been to obtain the Episcopal office on the ground that it would confer upon himself a real authority as a leader of the Methodist body. He did not intend that the two bodies should be comprehended in a large unity of plan or purpose. On the other hand, Bishop White and his brother prelates could not confer upon these two Methodist superintendents the full authority of the Episcopate without exacting sacred pledges that the dignity and prerogatives of the office would be faithfully regarded.¹

The movement fell through because neither party was willing to meet the conditions of the other, though the bishops were far wiser than any others who had to deal with this subject. When in the Convention of

¹ Bishop White's *Memoirs of the Church*, Dr. Da Costa's edition, pp. 195-199.

1856 the Memorial Movement, originated by Dr. Muhlenberg in 1853, was before the General Convention of that date, it was again, as in 1792, the Lower House which decided against that wise effort to reach out on the part of the Episcopal Church to a large comprehension of the needs of our Protestant Christianity. The Bishops of the Church in 1792 and in 1856 had a far higher and clearer sense of Catholic life and order than that entertained by the rank and file of the Episcopal Church, and it was not until 1886 that the declaration on Christian Unity was made by the House of Bishops and the Lower House was ready to unite in a standard of union which could be offered in behalf of comprehensive Christian unity, and even then the final terms of this famous declaration were less comprehensive than the Bishops in 1792 and 1856 were ready to accept. In this connection it is not without interest to state the beginning of Methodist Episcopacy, *fons et origo*. "The imposition of the hands" was not done publicly in the church, but in Wesley's bedchamber at Bristol, England. It was soon reported that Wesley had made Dr. Coke a Bishop; and his brother, the Rev. Charles Wesley, who was not in the secret, and did not approve of what he had done, wrote the following witty epigram:—

" So easily are Bishops made,
By man's or woman's whim;
Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,
But—who laid hands on him?"

The weakness of the Church at the beginning of the present century may be estimated in another way. It

was without endowments for the training of the clergy, without institutions of any kind, without any effort to undertake missions at home or abroad, and without the idea of doing anything beyond the maintenance of a bare existence. When Dr. Channing Moore was chosen Bishop of Virginia in 1814 there were seven clergymen and seventeen laymen present to elect him, and this was in a territory where before the Revolution more than ten times seven regularly served at the altar. When Bishop Seabury died in 1796 he was practically in charge of all New England. He made his visitations on horseback, or in a sulky, or by sea, as circumstances offered, and it was not until nearly the end of his life that an effort was made to furnish him with an Episcopal income, and even that was but a pittance, in no way meeting the demands of his office. Dr. Benjamin Moore, who succeeded Bishop Provoost, was supported on the Trinity foundation, and it was not until the Church had gone a long way down into the present century that in any diocese an adequate income was provided for the Bishop placed at its head. It was not until 1795 that Dr. Robert Smith was consecrated Bishop of South Carolina, and that diocese had no representative in any General Convention until 1814. The only condition on which its clergy entered into the general compact for organizing the Church in the United States was that no Bishop should be imposed upon them. It desired the autocracy of power neither in Church nor in State.

And yet in this very feebleness there was strength. This was the time when the Methodist circuit-rider

was the pastor of the settlers on the frontier in the new States opening west of the Alleghanies, the time when the country was just beginning to emerge from its deadly torpor after the war. It took from 1789 until 1811, when Dr. Hobart and Dr. Griswold were consecrated by Bishop White, respectively as Bishops of New York and of the Eastern Diocese, which meant all of New England but Connecticut, for the stricken and dismembered Episcopal Church to gather up its forces and prepare for active work. If these were years of solitude, they were also years of preparation. In each diocese some effort was made to advance the Church in the home field, and the men were beginning to appear here and there who were to be the leaders of the Church in the next generation. Bishop White had found a young man of promise in John Henry Hobart, another in Jackson Kemper, still another in William Augustus Muhlenberg, still another in James Milnor, and yet another in William H. De Lancey, all of whom were his assistants in the united churches in Philadelphia then under his parochial charge. Two other men came forward at about this time, who were only remotely influenced by Bishop White, but were destined to have an important part in the development of the Episcopal Church. One of these was Dr. Philander Chase, the first Bishop of Ohio, a man of remarkable individuality and power; the other was Alexander Viets Griswold, who was born in Simsbury, Connecticut, and who was consecrated with Dr. Hobart in 1811. Bishop Chase was the man for a pioneer diocese, and Bishop Hobart became the first one to raise the standard of

Churchmanship in the United States. Early in 1812 the Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania was formed. It did not originate with Bishop White, but it received the sanction and support of the Convention of the Diocese, and was cordially approved and aided by him in its organization and work. He united with Bishop Madison in different efforts to carry the Church beyond the Alleghany mountains into the new field, and in this way the Episcopal societies were organized in various parts of Ohio and in different parts of Kentucky and Tennessee.

CHAPTER VIII.

INSPIRING YOUNGER MEN.

THE story of Bishop White's career cannot be confined simply to a personal record. He was the Presiding Bishop of the whole Church in the United States ; and as years went on, he came to be regarded as the patriarch and father of the Anglican Communion in this country. He was deeply interested in every effort to advance the Church, both at home and in the foreign field ; but in days when the facilities for travel were few, and when the clergy were hardly sufficient to supply the existing parishes, and when there was no provision for the study of holy orders, the progress was necessarily slow and embarrassing. It is a remarkable fact that Bishop White gathered around him, either as assistant ministers or for purposes of instruction, the men who were in their generation largely to influence and guide the awakening life of the Church.

Jackson Kemper, who was for twenty years the assistant minister of St. James's Parish, Philadelphia, under Bishop White, was ordained deacon by him in 1811. He showed his fitness to be the first missionary Bishop of the Northwest by the way in which he spent his only two vacations during the whole period of his assistantship. In 1812 and in 1814 he was granted

leave of absence from the united churches to perform missionary tours in the West ; and in Western Pennsylvania, Western Virginia, and Eastern Ohio he took his first lessons in the work to which God was to call him later in life. In the wild regions of what was then the far West, he travelled extensively, and in many places was the first to hold Divine service according to the book of Common Prayer. It was in these fields that he had his zeal enkindled for the office of a missionary bishop, to which he was elected at the General Convention of 1835, when the Episcopal Church first rose in its full strength to the conception of what it had to do in the United States. He was the last person whom Bishop White consecrated to the Episcopal office. In St. Peter's Church, at Philadelphia, where, twenty-four years before he had knelt to take upon him the vows of a deacon, for the third time he knelt to have the venerable hands of his chief pastor and friend laid upon his head. He went forth from that sanctuary to be for eleven years literally a homeless man ; without his children, without his library, without even a study, travelling on horseback and on foot, preaching in wayside cabins, in taverns, in school-houses, and upper rooms, his saddle bags containing his worldly goods, — his robes and Communion Service, his Bible, and his Prayer-book. Few men ever gave themselves more unreservedly to missionary work. He was the great pioneer of the Northwest until he fell at his post in Wisconsin in 1871. He established prosperous dioceses in Missouri, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska.

Over all these regions Bishop Kemper was expected to travel, to watch their development, to seek out the scattered families of communicants, to found parishes in the growing towns, and to establish Church institutions. The following story shows how thoroughly he lived in the eyes of all men, and kept his office as bishop in the forefront of everything :—

“Two years ago we were in a railway carriage when the Bishop came in. A number of gentlemen were conversing, and the conversation turned on success in life. One of them, not a Churchman, known all over the West as one of its largest capitalists and most successful business men, remarked : ‘Gentlemen, there is a man [pointing to Bishop Kemper] who is the most successful man I know, as well as the most devoted to his business. When I look at him I consider myself an entire failure. He is the richest man in the Northwest.’ A rather obtuse personage in the company said, ‘Why, I did not know that the Bishop was rich.’ ‘Rich?’ was the answer; ‘why, he is so rich that he doesn’t think as much of a million dollars as you or I would of a hundred, and we are not paupers. Why, he’d give away a million on sight, and never miss it. What grubbing fellows he must consider such as we! Yes, the Bishop is rich. He’s the only man I could envy. The look on half the faces in this car when he came in was something all the money in the country could n’t buy!’”¹

This was the character and the career of one of the men whose life was largely fashioned under the influence of Bishop White.

Another man over whom the Bishop of Pennsylvania had great influence was Dr. Muhlenberg. Before there was any divinity school in the country he was one of

¹ The Christian Year, September, 1871, vol. i. p. 289.

three young men who used to recite regularly to Mr. Kemper, then the Bishop's assistant, and who also met once a fortnight in the Bishop's study to read essays of their own on subjects selected by the Bishop.¹ Young Muhlenberg, while the formation of a theological seminary was under consideration, read before him in 1817 an argument for a large general seminary, and pointed out how he would have it arranged. This is believed to have been the earliest open statement of the plan for the General Theological Seminary, which was established in 1820, and in it he differed radically from his revered father in the Church, who expressed his preference for the establishment of local or diocesan seminaries. Young Muhlenberg constantly accompanied Mr. Kemper in his visits among the sick and poor of the city, and continually sought opportunities for improvement which indicated his sympathy at that early age with the whole life of humanity. He had his first class in the Sunday-school at St. James's, Philadelphia, and that school was one of the first in the country; and here, at the request of Bishop White, he trained the first boy-choir in America. He was also instrumental in abolishing the clerk's reading of the responses, and especially the giving out of the metre psalm, which was a great annoyance in worship. A good story is told by him in further illustration of this practice:—

“Soon after my ordination, being in New York, accompanying Bishop White on his way to Hartford for the con-

¹ Life and Works of Dr. Muhlenberg, by Annie Ayres, p. 39 *et seq.*

secration of Bishop Brownell, at an evening party at my sister's, I asked Bishop Hobart how he, with his Church views, could allow a layman, every Sunday, in his presence, to stand up and exhort the people. He asked what I meant. I replied, 'The clerk giving out the psalm with the call to "sing to the praise and glory of God."' He laughed, and I know that not long after the practice was abolished in New York also."

In the second year of his divinity studies, Bishop White gave him a license as a lay reader. In the exercise of this office he felt more and more drawn to his future profession. He was also the manager of an auxiliary Bible society, composed chiefly of young men, and connected with the first Bible society in the country, of which Bishop White was president. His Church-father had counted greatly on having young Muhlenberg as one of his assistant ministers, and he was elected as his chaplain, as soon as he was admitted to the diaconate. The venerable Bishop and his youthful friend were well suited to each other. The older man liked the delicate sensibility and the retiring shyness which lent a wonderful charm to the originality and independence of his young friend. Interesting stories are told of both of them. A day or two after his ordination he was asked to baptize an infant in St. Peter's Church. His countenance flushed and his whole manner became embarrassed, and he earnestly requested Bishop White, who was present, to administer the sacrament for him; but the Bishop would have his young brother make a beginning, and would not yield. Another story is told of the first confirmation which he

attended as his chaplain. While the Right Reverend Father was laying hands on a chancelful of young people, an excited lady rushed up, exclaiming in a loud whisper: "Mr. Muhlenberg, the Bishop said *she!*" "Move him to the end of the row," was the quiet and instant rejoinder. The Bishop had mistaken the lady's son for a girl, but it was rectified when the round of the chancel was completed.

Still another anecdote illustrates the relations between the two. On the first Sunday of his officiating as assistant, the Bishop preached in the morning, and Mr. Muhlenberg read prayers, which was the deacon's part. In the afternoon when Mr. Muhlenberg was to preach, the Bishop put on the surplice to read prayers. The curate reminded him that to read prayers was his own duty as the assistant. The Bishop replied: "You read for me this morning, and I will read for you this afternoon." The young deacon begged in vain to be allowed to take his place in the desk, but the Bishop refused and walked out of the vestry, saying pleasantly, "Turn about is all fair." "Turn about!" said Mr. Muhlenberg in telling the story; "turn about between the Patriarch of the Church, then past seventy, and a boy honoured with the appointment of chaplain to him!" The vestrymen insisted that the assistant ought always to read prayers, and laughed at the arrangement as "Bishop Muhlenberg and Mr. White;" and the Bishop finally yielded to what was thought by them to be the right usage. Young Muhlenberg spent three years with him as deacon. Shortly after his admission to the priesthood, the Bishop took him to Lancaster,

Pa., when a church was to be consecrated. The service took place on Sunday, and in the afternoon Mr. Muhlenberg occupied the pulpit, and preached so well that the people immediately called him to the rectorship, which he, greatly to the regret of the Bishop, accepted. This did not terminate their affectionate intercourse, and Mr. Muhlenberg still retained his kindest regard, and was followed by him with constant sympathy in his later career.

Dr. Muhlenberg used to say that Bishop White became a better Churchman after Dr. Hobart was made Bishop of New York, than he was before. Young Hobart was practically educated by him, and had regarded him as his spiritual teacher from childhood, pointing out in his old age the very pew in Christ Church where he used to sit with his father and mother. He derived in the first instance all his ideas of the Church from Bishop White's personal instructions, and from the books which he loaned him to read.¹ He was confirmed by the Bishop in 1790, in his fifteenth year, and was a student in the University of Pennsylvania until 1793, when he finished his studies at Princeton, under Bishop White's advice. The first years of his ministry were spent at Oxford, in the Pennsylvania diocese. Here he was distinguished for his qualities as a debater, for his attachment to the Episcopal Church, and for his liberality towards Christians of other religious bodies. Bishop White followed him with constant interest as a spiritual adviser, and earnestly recommended him to study the Bible in

¹ Dr. Berrian's Memoir, Hobart's Works, vol. i. p. 52.

forming his opinions. After his ordination he was under the Bishop's control, and was located about ten miles from Philadelphia. He thus speaks with characteristic modesty of his relations to young Hobart: "Although his signal proficiency is the fruit of his own talents and industry, yet I have ever since pleased myself with the hope that he may have derived some little aid from what it occurred to me to suggest to him."¹ In the year 1800 he was called to be an assistant at Trinity Parish, New York, and quickly became one of the leading men in the diocese. Dr. McVickar says: "In the State Convention, from the day of his first appearance, he became what may be termed its business man. He was annually chosen its secretary from 1801 to 1811, when he was elected to be its Bishop, and during the whole of this period its official business rested on him."

As early as 1799, through the friendship of Bishop White, he had been appointed secretary to the House of Bishops; and he was regularly chosen both a member of the standing committee of the New York diocese and a delegate to represent it in the General Convention. Dr. McVickar notes as a coincidence "that the very first entry of his name on the minutes of the [diocesan] convention, the first year he sat in it, is in connection with the principle that marked all his subsequent course, — *Ecclesia est in Episcopo*. 'On motion of the Rev. Mr. Hobart, *Resolved*, That this Convention cannot with propriety act upon this memorial while this Church is destitute of a Bishop.' This

¹ Dr. Berrian's Memoir, Hobart's Works, vol. i. p. 67.

entry follows, in the journal of 1801, immediately after the resignation of Bishop Provoost.”¹ The confidence reposed in his judgment and in his practical talent placed him, even at that early age, among the wisest counselors of the Church. It was during this time that he wrote the series of books by which he was greatly to improve the devotional life of his own Communion, and prepare the way for a higher standard in ritual and a stronger statement of Church principles. Bishop Hobart died at the early age of fifty-five, in the year 1830, six years before Bishop White ended his life-work; but he put into that short career the energy and the vigour which made his influence more remarkable and more widely extended than that of any other man up to that time in the American Episcopate, except Bishop White, from whom, it is right to say, he derived his comprehensive grasp of the situation and the treatment of Church questions like a Christian statesman.

Bishop White had great difficulty among the Pennsylvania Quakers and the latitudinarian Churchmen of that region and further South, in asserting the principles of the Church. He always acted upon them himself, but he could not set them forth to the full extent that he believed in them. It is not here stated that he was ready to advocate all the opinions which Bishop Hobart held in regard to the priesthood, the holy communion, and the sacrifice of Christ; but it is certain that he never rebuked his disciple for holding more advanced views than he did, and, as has been said,

¹ Dr. McVickar's *Life of Bishop Hobart*, p. 200.

he was a better Churchman after Dr. Hobart entered the House of Bishops than he was before. The intimate and confidential relations in which the two men stood to one another is illustrated by the fact that it was to Bishop Hobart that his aged friend in September, 1819, addressed at his special desire a letter relating the incidents of the early part of his life, and it is more than likely that his "Memoirs of the Church" was suggested by the same party. Perhaps there was no one of the men whom Bishop White educated and loved, who in turn had greater influence upon him or consulted him oftener in the administration of Church affairs. Bishop Hobart was too independent and aggressive a man always to follow Bishop White's conservative methods, and he ruled a part of the Church in which his policy was accepted and carried out. In New York and in Connecticut the greater part of the strong Churchmen in the early years of this century were to be found; and if Bishop White inspired him as a young man, he did not in any visible way control his public action.

Two men are yet to be introduced in this portraiture of the persons who were pupils of Bishop White or pioneers under him as Presiding Bishop in extending the Church at this period, — Philander Chase and Alexander Viets Griswold. Philander Chase was a New Englander to the backbone, a self-made man, but one who never lost his individuality in his office, and had in him abundant raw materials for the making of a great man. It was apparently an accident that led him into the Episcopal Church; but from his first

reading of the Prayer-book he was an ardent Churchman, and induced his parents, brothers, sisters, and not a few others in the neighbourhood to follow his example. He became at once a lay reader, officiating as he had opportunity in different places in New Hampshire and Vermont, along the banks of the Connecticut River. He was born in 1775, — the same year in which Bishop Hobart was born, but he was utterly unlike him in temperament and Churchmanship. Indeed, when Mr. Chase — after graduating from Dartmouth in 1795, and receiving ordination at the hands of Bishop Provoost in 1798, and after a brief experience in New York State and New Orleans, during which his thoughts and anxieties were directed toward the great West as the field which it was his duty to occupy, and after a brief stay in Ohio, during which he had shown himself a very efficient leader — was nominated for the Episcopate by the first Convention of Ohio, Bishop Hobart was inclined to treat him with decided contempt. He neither liked his Churchmanship nor the headlong way in which he threw himself into difficulties, with the faith that somehow things would turn out right. Bishop White was the most charitable and liberal of the bishops who consecrated him, though Bishop Hobart assisted at his consecration. The latter treated him with greater kindness, after his return from a successful trip in England to raise funds for the diocese of what the English were pleased to call “Oh-i-o.” He was the founder of Kenyon College, and of the Gambier Theological Seminary, and in the height of his career was greatly admired and trusted. Though a man very dif-

ferent in temperament from Bishop Kemper, he had the same indomitable missionary spirit, and a still stronger purpose of having his own way in everything. His "Reminiscences" is as racy a work in its way as Boswell's "Life of Johnson."

He was a unique character, a truly Yankee bishop, a man who succeeded best where he was a law unto himself; and his pioneer work in Ohio and Illinois, for which he raised large sums in England, was the first instance, after the Revolution, in which English Churchmen contributed money for an American missionary enterprise. When dressed in full canonicals the large and portly old man was every inch a bishop, and his bearing was distinguished down to the smallest details. His wit even in sacred things was inimitable and keen, but it never interfered with his worship or his preaching. The story of his life reads like a romance. He was the first to show in American orders a type of Churchman in whom an overpowering individuality was the conspicuous feature. Bishop Smith speaks of him, when he presided over the House of Bishops, as one who gave that office an expression in human form as impressive and majestic as that which Daniel Webster made upon the American Senate. "And yet," he continues, "there was all the time a child-light in his eye, a quick and nervous play of the muscles of his face, and an archness of expression spread over his whole countenance, which, in his last daguerrotype, looks slyly above his glasses, and which will carry down to posterity no very incorrect impression that something queer within was being held under

constant restraint.”¹ His life was a daily surprise ; the Yankee and the ecclesiastic were strangely blended in his personal bearing and in his intense realization of the meaning of his office. Bishop Chase and Bishop Kemper were the two men who made their mark upon the country west of the Alleghanies during the life of Bishop White.

Alexander Viets Griswold was a New Englander, but a man of far different type, self-educated, and great by the force of mind and character that was in him. He was consecrated to the Episcopate in 1811, and did not have to ride on horseback to his jurisdiction, as Bishop Chase did, when he returned from Philadelphia to take charge of the Eastern Diocese. He was not much under the influence of Bishop White until he became, as a brother prelate, a welcome guest in the house of the Presiding Bishop when the General Convention was held in Philadelphia, but he was a man of similar spirit and similar dignity of character. It is necessary to take into account what he did in order to obtain a faithful picture of the whole Church during Bishop White's leadership. Two causes led to the formation of the Eastern Diocese. There was special need of a bishop to watch over the infancy of the parishes Episcopally constituted, and the weakness of the Church in the Eastern States rendered each commonwealth separately inadequate to the maintenance of a bishop. The growth of the Episcopal Church in this region had been stoutly resisted by the New England

¹ Dr. Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. v., p. 459.

people, and all their institutions were hostile to its introduction. Bishop Bass was engaged in active duty only six years, having been consecrated in 1797, and Bishop Parker, who was consecrated in September, 1804, died in the December following, without ever having met his convention. In 1805 the Massachusetts Convention urged the joining of Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts in one diocese, and the choosing of a single bishop to serve them all. It was slow work to bring about this result. It was not easy to secure unanimity of feeling or harmony of action. The territory was large ; the clergy were scattered ; and it was difficult to gain the consent of the several parties to this united action.

Mr. Griswold preached a sermon at the Convention held in Boston in 1810 to elect a Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, and a Congregational minister of Boston, who heard it and asked who this man was, on being informed that he had just been elected Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, rejoined : " Well, I can only say that if such is to be the general character of his preaching, he is worthy to be made Archbishop of Christendom." ¹ His natural qualities indicated rare fitness for the Episcopate, and no man could have been chosen who more completely reversed in his severe, simple, and primitive manners, the Puritan prejudices against Episcopacy which had existed ever since the settlement of the country. He had every gift that was needed in those days to make his work successful. He was in the prime of life ; he had sanctified common

¹ Dr. John S. Stone's Memoir of Bishop Griswold, p. 159.

sense ; he had the patience and humility to illustrate the spiritual character of a bishop in a rare degree ; and he had plenty of the wisdom of this world in his dealings with men and in the direction of affairs.

It was an anxious moment when the call was issued for his consecration. It was with the greatest difficulty that the three bishops necessary to a canonical consecration were brought together. Bishop Moore of New York had just been "visited by a paralytic stroke." Bishop Claggett of Maryland, just recovering from a severe illness, attempted to reach New Haven, but was compelled to return. Bishop Madison of Virginia felt bound, under "the solemnity of an oath," not to leave the duties of the College of which he was President. Bishop Provoost, the senior of Bishop Moore in New York, had "never performed any ecclesiastical duty since the appointment of his assistant in 1801," and at this time was only beginning to recover from an attack of the jaundice. Bishop White and Bishop Jarvis of Connecticut were the only bishops to be had. Bishop Provoost was finally prevailed upon to leave his retirement and give his attendance, though up to the last moment it was feared that he could not attend ; and thus, says Bishop White, "the business was happily accomplished."

Hardly had Bishop Griswold become acquainted with his Episcopal duties before the great defection in the Congregational Churches of Massachusetts became the all-absorbing religious interest of the community. It embraced the flower of the Puritan clergy and a large proportion of the intelligent and cultivated laity. The

defection from the old theology was common throughout all the New England States, but the Episcopal Church was so weak that in the section called the Eastern Diocese it had little or no power to assert successfully its claims as a more reasonable and wholesome form of religion. It was too weak to emphasize its qualities; but in Connecticut, where the Church had been comparatively strong for a century, the Unitarian movement made no progress, and those who departed from the standing order became Churchmen, almost without exception. It is a curious point in the evolution of the religious life of New England that wherever the Episcopal Church was strong enough to show the development of the Christian life upon a broad and Catholic basis, the Unitarian defection was held within the limits of the Catholic faith and reinforced it with its generous culture. Had the Church been as strong in Massachusetts as it then was in Connecticut, it is not unreasonable to think that the Unitarian body could never have been organized upon a successful basis. Bishop Griswold could do nothing to arrest or absorb this movement, but he created the impression that the Episcopal Church was the home of piety and learning, and he dispelled the prejudices against the Church more than anybody else. He gradually lifted up the Episcopal parishes, far and near, to a position of respectability and influence. He did in the Eastern Diocese what Bishop White did in Pennsylvania and Maryland and Virginia and in the dioceses farther South. He counselled the best use of the influences to be had, and worked quietly by unsensational methods

in a community that was often bitterly hostile to his faith. His public career was contemporary with that of Channing, and though the two men probably never met, they had much in common in their ethical views of Christianity.

This review of the first outputting of strength in the Episcopal Churches of the United States presents Bishop White in the position of a wise and conservative leader, who educated and guided the best men within his reach, and either sent them forth as his pupils or aided them with his friendly counsel in the ventures of faith which they were induced to undertake. It was not a period for great things, not a time when the Church could put forth its strength and work by institutions as well as by men, not a time when the soil was ripe for marked advances. The thinking in religion of the original founders of the country was as yet unquestioned and unimpaired. What their fathers believed, the sons transmitted, and no decided advance was possible for new inquiries. The Methodist circuit-rider, travelling on horseback from settlement to settlement among the scattered pioneers of the frontier, was the person who was successfully building up a new generation in what was, to most of them, a new faith.

CHAPTER IX.

WORKING TO LARGER ENDS.

THERE were two drawbacks to the growth of the Episcopal Church in the first part of this century. One was the absence of institutions for educating and training its clergy, and the other was the depressed condition of the larger number of the parishes on account of the Revolution. They were so nearly destroyed that they were a long time in reviving. Perhaps a third reason should be assigned in the beginnings of party feeling in the dioceses of Virginia and Maryland and Pennsylvania. There was a notable instance of this in the election of Dr. Kemp as the Bishop of Maryland, which came near creating an "Evangelical Episcopal Church" in that diocese, established on almost identically the basis of what is known as the "Reformed Episcopal Church" in our own day. The earliest movement toward a school for the education of the clergy was made in Maryland. It was the intention to establish it at Washington. The General Theological Seminary was not then in existence, neither had any diocese in 1813 founded a school for theological instruction within its limits. Bishop White was constantly exercised over this matter, and believed that the best way out was to establish

diocesan schools, though when seven years later it was finally decided by the General Convention to establish one school for the whole country, he acquiesced in the decision, and was always loyal to that institution.

The beginning of the General Theological Seminary was in the General Convention of 1814, when the Rev. Dr. Gadsden of South Carolina offered a resolution that a committee be appointed, with the consent of the House of Bishops, to take into consideration the institution of a theological seminary. It was voted down; but by a subsequent resolution the whole matter was referred to the Bishops. Nothing was done until the Convention of 1817, when a committee of three Bishops — White, Hobart, and Croes — and two clergymen was appointed to solicit subscriptions in different parts of the country for the school. It was the intention to locate it in New York City, but to solicit the subscriptions in such a way that the whole Church in the United States would feel a common interest in it. Much time was taken in the Convention of 1820 in transferring the Theological School from New York to New Haven, and a special Convention was called in 1821 to remove it back to New York, where a diocesan seminary had already been begun under the auspices of Bishop Hobart. The starting of this institution quickly aroused the interest of Virginia in undertaking a training-school, which should gather candidates in Virginia and Maryland and Pennsylvania, and which should be more evangelical than it was feared that the New York institution could possibly be under the control of Churchmen of the type

of Bishop Hobart. This resulted in the organization of the Alexandria Seminary in 1823, which, though not a rival of the New York school, was from the first intended to emphasize the Low Church ideas of the district in which it was located. As between the two, Bishop White gave his support and influence to the New York school, and in the latter years of his Episcopate was its annual visitor. He also gave the parting address to its students nearly every year down to the end of his life.

At this time the Church was rapidly increasing in every diocese. The clergy numbered about three hundred, and the subscriptions for the New York and the Alexandria schools showed that the people were ready to give money for religious purposes. While the General Convention of 1820 was engaged in settling the permanent location of the General Seminary in New York, it also initiated the first domestic and foreign missionary movement in the Episcopal Church in the United States, and made the Presiding Bishop the head of the society. It was high time that the Church had put forth some organized effort both at home and abroad ; and this society accomplished great good in its constantly extending operations, for a period of fifteen years. Then, at the meeting of the General Convention in 1835, the organization was entirely changed, and the Church undertook and agreed, in her representative character as the body of Christ, to carry on the work of Christian missions. In 1829 a Board of Missions was organized, with two committees of seven members each, — one to direct the Foreign

Missions, and the other to have charge of the Domestic Missions. The High Churchmen took the home field, and the Low Churchmen the foreign field. The latter concentrated their interest in the Alexandria Seminary, while the Church as a whole bent its energies upon the Western field, first sending out a missionary leader to Wisconsin to labour among the Indians at Green Bay, and soon after commissioning Bishop Kemper with the duty of planting parishes in the then undeveloped Northwest.

Bishop White was a comprehensive man, and took an active interest in both branches of the missionary work. There was no right or left hand in his interest in the kingdom of Christ. The foreign field was under consideration as early as June, 1822. It was the design to establish a mission on the western coast of Africa; but it was some time before suitable men could be found to engage in this work. At length Mr. John Payne, then a student in the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, expressed his wish to go, when ordained, as a missionary to Africa, and was assigned to Cape Palmas as the field of his labors. Mr. Payne embarked for Africa on the 18th of May, 1837, and subsequently became Bishop of Africa, where he carried on the work until his death, many years later. A mission was also established among the Greeks by Dr. Robertson, afterwards missionary at Constantinople. In the fall of 1830 he was the first to begin, with the late Dr. Hill, a missionary work at Athens, which was largely confined to the education of poor children of both sexes. His work was not in antagonism to the Greek Church, but rather supplementary

to it. A mission to Constantinople was undertaken by the Rev. Horatio Southgate, who was appointed in November, 1835, an exploring missionary agent to this and the adjacent countries ; but the result of his work, though not due to any lack of devotion on his part, was not what had been expected. The Foreign Missionary Society resolved to establish a mission in China on the 13th of May, 1834 ; but it was not until the 23d of March, 1835, that the Rev. Francis R. Hanson embarked for Canton to organize this work. Two years later the Rev. W. J. Boone, subsequently consecrated Bishop of Shanghai, China, entered upon this field as a missionary at Singapore. These efforts were the fruit of the awakened zeal of the Episcopal Church at this time ; but they were feeble ventures as compared with the more energetic development of missionary enterprises in the South and West.

At this time Bishop Chase was engaged in laying the foundations for the Church in Ohio. He had been consecrated in 1819, returning to his missionary field on horseback as soon as the services were over, and zealously entering upon his Episcopal duties. In 1821 he conceived the idea that the assistance of the Church of England might be successfully invoked in aid of an effort to establish a seminary designed to supply the West with ministers, and he determined to go forth and see what he could do. Bishop Hobart, whom he met in New York on his way to England, was strenuously opposed to his going abroad for this purpose. He had little faith in Bishop Chase's judgment and wisdom, and visiting England at the same

time, he did a great deal toward thwarting his mission. Bishop Chase was not a High Churchman, and this fact had to do with Bishop Hobart's opposition to him; but the Bishop of Ohio came back with twenty thousand dollars in 1824, to which ten thousand more was subsequently added, for the foundation of Kenyon College and of the Gambier Theological Seminary of Ohio. The very strong individuality which enabled him to found these institutions and take charge of them, and still act as the head of the diocese, led to his resignation as President, and as Bishop of Ohio, in September, 1831. He then started for the western wilderness, settling in Michigan near the borders of Indiana, and in 1835 becoming the first Bishop of Illinois. He remained a missionary to the end of his life. This was only one field of development in the American Church.

As early as 1812, Bishop White had his eye upon the consecration of a bishop for the churches lying beyond the Alleghany Mountains. Only once, in June, 1822, did he cross the Alleghanies, and then it was too late to repair the loss occasioned by the neglect to enter earlier upon this great and growing field. Bishop Perry well says, "Had the plea of the faithful Doddridge and his few associates been listened to and their request for a bishop granted, the Church would have been a leader in the van of the country's progress, and much of the great West would have been moulded from the start in her holy ways!"¹ The

¹ The History of the American Episcopal Church, vol. ii. p. 239.

delay in supplying bishops for the independent diocese was owing undoubtedly to the feebleness of the parishes in the different States, and their inability to support a bishop if they had one ; but it was almost fatal to the seizing of the opportune moment for the rapid and large growth of the Episcopal Church. Even in the East the securing of bishops for each State was a slow process. New Jersey, dating its organization back to the year 1775, had no bishop until 1815. Delaware, represented in the earliest conventions, had no bishop until 1841. North Carolina, though organized at the start, in 1790, on the principle that a bishop should be at once secured, was without one until 1823. Maine, organized in 1820, secured the Episcopate in 1847. Georgia waited from 1823 to 1841 for this boon. Mississippi, where the Church had been begun during the days of Spanish domination in 1792, though organized in 1825, waited until 1850 for its first bishop, the apostolic William Mercer Green. Tennessee, though organized in 1828, did not receive the Episcopate until 1834 ; and Kentucky, which had received the Church during the earlier days of its settlement, waited until 1832 for a bishop. Michigan had Church services within its borders before the Revolution, but was only able to organize in 1832, and to secure a bishop in 1836 ; and Missouri waited five years longer, and Indiana eleven, before these feeble organizations respectively received a head.

These facts show how slowly the Episcopal Church advanced when it was in the first glow of prosperity ; but if the gains seem moderate to us, they did not

seem so to the venerable Bishop Green, who said when he took leave of the General Convention of 1883: "Of the Convention of 1823, which met in this city, I alone am alive. When I went into holy orders, sixty-three years ago, there were nine bishops in the Church; when I look around me to-day in the House of Bishops, I cast my eyes upon more than seven times that number. How hath God wrought! His blessing hath been upon the Church, and she hath prospered." In 1835, during the last General Convention at which Bishop White presided, Jackson Kemper was consecrated the first Missionary Bishop of the Northwest, and in his sermon at this consecration, Bishop Doane expressed the awakening to new life when he laid down the principle that this "Church is to be a Missionary Church, that her Bishops are true Apostles, and that of this missionary body every Christian by the terms of his baptismal vow is a member."



CHAPTER X.

THE RISE OF PARTY SPIRIT.

FROM the beginning of the existence of the Church of England in different parts of the Atlantic States there was a division of sentiment in regard to Church principles. The religious life of the century before the Revolution was toned down to latitudinarianism and to the dreary platitudes of the Hanoverian period, but early in the nineteenth century there was an invigorating of the ecclesiastical life in Connecticut and in New York. It was principally due to the fact that in both States a great many native Americans examined the polity and principles of the Church and entered into its spiritual life. Bishop Seabury was the representative of this advance in Connecticut, and Bishop Moore, who succeeded Bishop Provoost, and after him Bishop Hobart, made New York the strong abiding place of High Churchmen. On the other hand, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia represented great indifference to Church principles. There was a certain loyalty to the Prayer-book as it was then understood and interpreted, but there was widespread laxity in following the rubrics and in teaching the Church system. The surplice was not commonly used, and the black gown was everywhere worn in preaching. Even the sacraments of the

Church were infrequently administered, the Holy Communion not more than three or four times a year, and baptism only in families where it was desired. The idea was that the minimum of churchly practices was to be desired, and that the nearer the Episcopal Church came to the usages and beliefs of other bodies the more it was a sign of true Christian unity.

In due time this division of sentiment began to assert itself in decided views on Church questions. Bishop White's moderate handling of Episcopacy in the communities where he lived was especially an attempt on his part to prevent the raising of party questions, and to conciliate persons who held divergent views and yet were within the same religious body. His celebrated pamphlet, devising an Episcopal Church with Episcopacy left out, was written with special reference to the holding of people together upon a basis of unity which would include all the clergy in the country in 1782 ; though it was far enough from expressing his whole belief in Church principles. He was a great deal stronger Churchman than he seemed to be in those early days, though, in contrast to Bishop Seabury, in his desire to keep the whole Church together, he seemed like a moderate man ; but when party spirit began to rage, and Philadelphia became a hot-bed of Low Churchmen, Bishop White was anything but a party man. He utterly refused to be the spokesman of a party. When he was personally assailed in his Diocesan Convention, his face flushed to the roots of his hair, as he said, " I had as lief be called a Jew or a Turk as a Low Churchman." One of his clergy insulted him in

this Convention by saying, "We all know that our Bishop is not a praying man." It was also urged as an evidence of his lack of personal piety that he used silver forks at his table.

These remarks indicate the bitterness which grew up in Philadelphia about the year 1825, and culminated in the election of Dr. Henry U. Onderdonk as Assistant Bishop of Pennsylvania on the 25th of October, 1827. It is not well to go into minute details concerning the conduct of men who were now first called Low Churchmen, and who distinguished themselves by abusive treatment of their venerable Bishop. One of the leaders of this party spirit was the Rev. Dr. Gregory T. Bedell, the father of the late Bishop Bedell, who, with the late Dr. Stephen H. Tyng of New York, were for a long time the leaders of the Low Church party. Bishop White knew how to deal with the people who assailed him. He delivered an address at the opening of the special Convention called to consider the expediency of electing an Assistant Bishop, which was a masterpiece of wise and politic advice. What he feared was that a Low Church bishop might be chosen, but he strictly avoided any attempt to give direction to the proceedings, only venturing to point out what kind of a man was required in a bishop. He must be a man of piety, well furnished with a knowledge of theological literature, and attached to the institutions of the Church, in doctrine, in worship, in ecclesiastical constitution, and in government. He states that this sentiment, on which he had acted for more than half a century, is "so far from being incon-

sistent with liberality to forms of profession preferred by our fellow Christians of various denominations, that it is the only ground on which peace and mutual good will between us can be maintained." He ventures to say "that he had found the fruit of it himself in the friendships of many wise and pious persons whose sentiments on some points differed materially from his own; whereas, had their theories been brought into collision under the same roofs, there is no knowing in what degree there might have been the excitement of unamiable sensations, nor to what extent the consequences might have been injurious."

He deliberately faced the issue which the Low Churchmen threatened to make. He said: —

"Could it be supposed probable, that there will be hereafter a bishop of this diocese, who shall either openly oppose himself to the recited properties of our communion, or endeavour to undermine them insidiously and by degrees, heavy will be his responsibility. Should his talents be equal to the meditated undertaking, he may distract and divide the Church, but he will not consummate his work."

The venerable Bishop expresses himself still more keenly on the possibilities of a partisan associate in the Episcopate when he reaches the end of his address. It is visible in the following words: —

"Of the body now assembled, it is trusted by him who addresses them that they will not lose sight of the shape in which the recited points have been brought before them. It has been the disclosing of a solicitude resting on the mind of the speaker, not merely as applicable to the present crisis, but as reaching the concerns of the diocese when

his voice will be heard in them no more, and perhaps while it may still be heard, either by the failure of a choice at the present meeting or by the non-compliance with it when made. Having been so long occupied in sustaining the principles which have been detailed, and being desirous of continuing his testimony whenever it shall be especially called for, he has conceived of the present as an opportunity not to be unimproved. Could he foresee that during the Episcopacy either now or at any future time the stated points will be either dismissed or disregarded, he would make some such request as that of Hagar in the wilderness in reference to what has so long been an object of his anxieties, of his prayers, and of his exertions, — ‘Let me not see the death of the child!’”

At this point the voice of the Bishop was choked by the violence of his emotion, and it was some time before he could go on.

As early as 1823 the Low Churchmen in Pennsylvania had begun to marshal their forces as a party, and the first manifestation of their power was shown in the Diöcesan Convention of that year in the election of delegates to the General Convention. In the year 1824, during the sitting of the Convention at Norristown, the lines were more strictly drawn, and in the year 1825, though there was no open collision between the two parties, they were evidently measuring their strength against one another. When Bishop White, being then nearly eighty years of age, proposed that an Assistant Bishop should be chosen by the diocese, he gave expression to his solicitude in the address the substance of which has already been quoted. The anxiety which he betrayed in that document was fully

justified by what took place. The candidate of the Low Churchmen was Rev. William Meade, afterwards the Bishop of Virginia, and the two parties were so evenly divided that no election was possible. After this test of their strength, Mr. Meade declined to be a candidate, and at a subsequent Convention the Rev. Henry U. Onderdonk, D.D., was elected to this office. This did not allay the irritation of the Low Churchmen. They had been beaten, but they were not ready to accept the situation. Before the Convention met at Harrisburg, at which Dr. Onderdonk was elected, five Low Churchmen sent out a confidential circular in order to strengthen the members of their party and to gather fresh recruits ; but they were not strong enough to elect their candidate, after Mr. Meade had withdrawn from the contest.

The pamphlet literature then issued is a present testimony to the war of words which was carried on between individuals at this time. The Rev. William H. De Lancey wrote a telling pamphlet under the signature of "Plain Truth," which was answered by the other party. He was then the minister at St. Peter's, under Bishop White, and did not hesitate to speak in this controversy with great plainness of what the other party was doing. He wrote two or three other pamphlets before the controversy was over. There is more truth than fiction in the following passage, taken from his second pamphlet, in which he describes the treatment of the aged Bishop : —

"The ruthless hand of party excitement has spared neither his character, his feelings, nor his principles. He

has lived to see a few misguided youths, to all of whom he had extended a cordial hand of welcome, when at different but not remote intervals they entered his diocese, and to none of whom has he ever manifested the least unkindness, leagued together in hostility against him, raising before his very face the standard, and proclaiming in his very ears the notes of deliberate and determined opposition; and now, because there are some who have not yet laid aside their veneration for age, their affection for his person, and their respect for his principles, he is held up by one of the champions of the party, who has been not one year within the diocese, as an object of mockery and ridicule."

The language which these men applied to Bishop White is not worth quoting at this distance of time, but an incident is mentioned by Dr. De Lancey in his reference to the proceedings of the special Convention of 1826, in his first pamphlet, which shows the spirit of the Low Churchmen in that early day better than anything else. He writes:—

"In the course of the session of that body, the Right Rev. Bishop White was deliberately told by a layman [Mr. S. J. Robbins], of the most active description among those who are self-styled evangelical, that the reason why he [the layman] had opposed a proposition to appoint a committee to accelerate the organization of the Convention was, that he thought the Bishop would not act impartially in the selection of the committee. The answer of the venerable prelate of eighty years, to this gross indignity, was, 'I thank you for the good opinion you entertain of me.'"

This insult, publicly offered, was never publicly retracted. The activity of the Bishop's enemies did not

stop when Dr. Onderdonk had been elected. They sent a remonstrance to the bishops to prevent, if possible, his consecration, and it was exceedingly doubtful up to the 23d of October, 1827, whether they would be justified in proceeding with the service: but the day before it was to take place each bishop who was to have a part in the consecration put on record his testimony that there was nothing in the charges that had been made against Dr. Onderdonk, or against the method pursued in his election, which forbade his being advanced to the Episcopate; and on the 25th of October the consecration took place.

Thus ended a bitter and protracted contest, the first and only one which took place in Pennsylvania in Bishop White's lifetime, a struggle that caused him a great deal of worry and anxiety, and indicated that he had a hot-bed of religious strife in his own diocese. Many of the Low Churchmen who were engaged in this contest lived to be heartily ashamed of their conduct, and the venerable Bishop left behind him papers which amply vindicate his own course at every point where charges were brought against him. It may seem unwise to mention this contest here, but it was the first outbreak of a party which has been in the past antagonistic to the development of the Episcopal Church, and which in the days of its numerical strength was a constant source of irritation and trouble in the growth of the Church. It would be at the expense of historical truthfulness if its doings at this time were ignored. The best testimony to the impartiality of Bishop White in the management of his diocese is that he controlled,

without suppressing, the operations of this party, which had its stronghold in the diocese of Pennsylvania. Until 1871, when the power of the Low Church party was broken, its latest throes as a body having been manifested in the New York Convention of 1874, it was constantly an irritating element in the work of the Episcopal Church. It set up claims which could not be maintained in a candid interpretation of the Prayer-book, and it was a constant vexation within a Communion which was not strong enough to support hostile societies, and keep up a party warfare within itself.¹

¹ The story of the election of the first Assistant Bishop in the American Church, here briefly told, is given at great length and with all the party colouring of a heated contest in Dr. John Henry Hopkins's "*Life of Bishop Hopkins*;" and a complete collection of the pamphlets and broadsides and circulars then issued has been preserved by Mr. Thomas H. Montgomery, who is the family custodian of the Bishop White papers. As a piece of inside history, and as an account of the rise of party spirit in the American Church, the story of this contest is deeply interesting.

CHAPTER XI.

REMINISCENCES.

DR. SPRAGUE in his "Annals of the American Pulpit" contributes a brief account of two interviews with Bishop White, which in the dearth of information regarding his personality is very welcome. He says: "I had the pleasure of a slight acquaintance with Bishop White, sufficient to render him an object of my enduring gratitude and veneration. I was first introduced to him in 1816, by a letter from a lady in Virginia, between whom and himself there had long existed an intimate friendship; and the kind and genial manner in which I was received by him satisfied me that I could not have presented myself under better auspices. His person seemed to me majestic. His countenance was divided between intelligence and loveliness, and occasionally it would light up into a fountain of sunbeams. The almond tree was in full blossom. His manner was so simple and natural and yet so cultivated; so dignified and yet so bland and winning, and his conversation was so rich and edifying, and withal such a revelation of the past, that it really seemed to me that I had then never stood in a presence in which all the virtues and all the graces were brought together in such goodly fellowship. I had

another interview with him, a few years after I entered the ministry, which only confirmed my previous impressions of the beauty and elevation of his character. I had occasion also, at two or three different periods, to ask favours of him, and they were granted as cheerfully and promptly as if I had always sustained to him the relation of an intimate friend. His whole character seemed to me radiant with wisdom, dignity, and purity.”¹

Dr. Henry U. Onderdonk, who was chosen in 1827 as the Assistant Bishop of Pennsylvania, furnished Dr. Sprague with the following reminiscences : —

“ Bishop White’s theological opinions are contained in his several works ; they were decidedly anti-Calvinistic, and may be classed with what was currently denominated Arminianism in the last century, which, however, you are aware, was not the system of Arminius. He was, to the last, strongly opposed to the theory comprised in the words, Priest, Altar, Sacrifice ; this being one of the very few points on which he was highly sensitive. The good Bishop’s ecclesiastical views were those known in history as Low Church ; it was not the Low-Churchmanship of the present day, but that of Tillotson, Burnet, and that portion of the English Divines with which they were associated. He regarded with no favour stimulating methods, extempore prayer, deviations from the Liturgy, etc. Yet, though stern against the priestly doctrine, as well as decidedly averse to modern Low-Churchmanship, he was, on the other hand, most particularly attached to Bishop Hobart, and

¹ Annals of the American Pulpit, vol. v. p. 284.

very largely under his influence, except in the few matters of which he was eminently tenacious ; while, on the other hand, he was not only courteous, but altogether friendly with leaders on the opposite side. In which facts may plainly enough be read the almost unbounded amiableness of his temper and principles.

“Bishop White was prominent in organizing the American Episcopal Church. That he was equally so in arranging the Prayer-book is not probable. He was on the Committee that formed what is called the ‘Proposed Book,’ which soon passed away, and of which Dr. William Smith [the elder] was, I have no doubt, the chief projector,—he was chairman of the committee and received a special vote of thanks, in 1785. Our present Liturgy is but the English one, with unimportant changes, except the addition to the Communion Service, which is due to Bishop Seabury, and to which Bishop White was opposed, though yielding to the urgency of his compeer. The Institution Office is later, and the production of Dr. William Smith, the younger.

“There was no reserve with Bishop White in avowing his age, but, till within a few years of his death, he was very unwilling to be thought feeble. A considerable time before I came to Philadelphia, his vestries, I understand, had released him from attending funerals ; but I almost always, in those at which I was present, observed him, not among the clergy, but in the general train of followers. He did not like that any one should accompany him home in the evening. On one occasion I was doing so, yet endeavoring to

conceal my purpose. At length, finding that I went several squares out of the way to my house, he stopped, and turning to me, said, 'I believe I must tell you, as General Washington once did some friends, "Gentlemen, if you see me home, I shall see you home."' It was but a few years before his death that he began to use a cane. For a year or two he accepted, in walking, the arm of his son."¹

Bishop Alonzo Potter, who succeeded Dr. Onderdonk in the Pennsylvania Episcopate, also helped Dr. Sprague to important materials for a sketch of Bishop White. He says:—

"When about eighteen years old I came to Philadelphia [in 1818], having just graduated at College, and during some eight or nine months I saw a good deal of Bishop White. My impressions of him were the more vivid, as I was at this time baptized and confirmed by him, and received my first communion at his hands. He was then, I think, somewhat past seventy, in full health, perfectly erect, and without any of the attenuation of age. His face was singularly benignant and beautiful, though it had, perhaps, less of the surprising grace and gentleness which characterized his later years, and which have been so exquisitely preserved by the artist Inman. I saw him often in the pulpit and chancel, in a book-store which he frequented almost daily, and occasionally in private houses. Becoming also, at this time, a candidate for the ministry, I enjoyed his supervision and counsel in

¹ *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. v. p. 285.

my theological studies, although my immediate preceptor was the Rev. Samuel H. Turner, now Dr. Turner, of the General Theological Seminary in New York. After a few months I left Philadelphia, and from that time to the close of his life I met him only occasionally, at meetings of the Board of Missions and at the sessions of the General Convention. I mention these facts to show how far my opportunities of observing him reached.

“One trait in his character struck me immediately, — it was the absence of self-consciousness. Beyond any one then living, he was the object, throughout Philadelphia, among people of every religious denomination, of respect and affection. This was very apparent when he appeared in the streets. But he was not a man who loved greetings in the market places, and to be called of men ‘Rabbi, Rabbi.’ He therefore betrayed no sense of his own consequence. He invited no salutations, although he was never wanting in a proper recognition of them. He moved along very quietly, and generally at a slow pace, and was, I do not doubt, entirely ignorant of a thousand little demonstrations of regard and veneration, which a man of morbid self-esteem would have been prompt to discover and rejoice in. In his public ministrations and in private intercourse it was the same. He never claimed anything for himself. His opinions, though delivered with the air of a man who held them clearly and decidedly, were, to a singular extent, devoid of anything peremptory or exacting. No man was more tolerant of differences of opinion, and some of his most cherished and unbroken

friendships were with men (like Bishop Hobart) from whom he differed materially up to the close of his life.

“His public ministrations were not, at this time, very attractive to a youth. His delivery was monotonous, though few voices had greater sweetness or apparent flexibility. His style was deficient in point and force, and the models on which he had unconsciously formed himself were not favourable to a bold and commanding eloquence. No one, however, not even an immature young man like myself, could listen to him with attention without knowing that he was receiving the admonitions and instructions of a wise and good man. He was a well-read theologian, of the school of Burnet and Tillotson, with more of patristic learning than was at all common in those days either in England or in this country. There were few questions, either among those which had divided his own Church, or those which had separated her from the Church of Rome on the one side and from other Protestant bodies on the other, which he did not seem to have considered carefully; and the results of his reading and reflection dropped richly from him in his sermons, but in a manner so unobtrusive, and one might almost say so shy, that it often escaped notice.

“In private he was exceedingly instructive and entertaining. He abounded in anecdote, which he told with evident self-enjoyment. His fund of information seemed inexhaustible. He had read largely in the solid English writers of the last two centuries, — historians, statesmen, and philosophers. His memory

seemed to give him perfect command of whatever he had read. He was, to an uncommon degree, conscientious in his statements, as well as in giving his opinions. Shortly before leaving Philadelphia, I called to take my leave of him, and, while thanking him for his kindness, I ventured to ask his opinion on a point which has much divided theologians, and about which I imagined he might not be over anxious to commit himself. His answer was brief, but clear, and left me no doubt that he held substantially the opinions that were imputed to him. On the following evening I attended service at a church where he was present, and was sent for to come to him as the congregation retired. He then stated that, in reflecting on the conversation of the previous day, he had some doubt whether he had made himself perfectly understood. He therefore referred me to a passage in one of the books of Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' as expressing with greater fullness and precision his own opinions.

"I should do him and my own recollections great injustice, if I conveyed the impression that he held his opinions haltingly, or was timid in the expression of them. He abhorred contention, and often therefore restrained himself when he thought speaking or writing was more likely to gender strife than to advance truth. He had, moreover, a wide mind, and could see the strong points of an adversary, so that he was not in haste to charge all who differed from him with wanting honesty or intelligence. He was also pre-eminently gentle and kind, and from the earliest years of his childhood he had felt upon his own heart a sense of

the Divine Presence. Such a temper and experience necessarily qualified his views of practical and theoretical religion. He could not well, under any circumstances, have been a passionate follower of Augustine in theology, or of Wesley or Whitefield in their views of experimental piety. The opinions, however, which he did hold, he never hesitated to avow, whenever he thought the interests of men required it. One of his last acts was to deliver a charge, entitled 'The Past and the Future,' which was as creditable to his moral courage as it was to his foresight.

"In respect to his courage, few men were ever more favoured. The horrors of pestilence, whether in the shape of yellow fever or Asiatic cholera, had no effect on him, when duty called him to encounter them. He sent his family to a distance, and gave night and day to the offices of religion, by the bed-side of the sick and over the graves of the dead. Few spectacles have had more of the moral sublime than was presented by this aged Bishop, verging on fourscore and five years, and yet daily taking his rounds among the victims of cholera, in 1832, when many a younger clergyman felt authorized to withdraw altogether from the perilous contact.

"He never courted danger; he never shrank from it when it came hand in hand with duty. At the opening of the Revolution, he was about to retire to Maryland, but hearing, on the road, that he had been chosen Chaplain to the Continental Congress, he instantly turned his horse's head towards Philadelphia, without stopping to take leave of his family. In his intercourse

with men, even those whom he most respected, he was equally dauntless. The following is an incident in point: He was proverbially punctual. On two successive occasions a board to which he belonged failed to make a quorum for the transaction of business, because of the absence of one or two distinguished gentlemen, who, he knew, might have been present without inconvenience. He expressed his indignation that he and his associates should be thus trifled with, and avowed his determination to move, at the first opportunity, a standing rule that trustees thus absent, without sufficient cause, should be understood to have vacated their seats. At the next meeting, both these gentlemen being present, and both his personal friends, he made the motion, and was with difficulty dissuaded from pressing it to a vote.

“During the winter of 1818, which I passed in Philadelphia, two bishops were consecrated at Christ Church by Bishop White, — Chase of Ohio, and Bowen of South Carolina. These solemnities brought together several of his Episcopal brethren, such as Bishop Hobart of New York, Bishop Kemp of Maryland, and Bishop Croes of New Jersey. It was delightful to see the habitual deference and the earnest affection with which they all regarded him; and to a young man, a stranger to the world, it was particularly striking to contrast the characters of these men, and to observe, when they came together, how the contrasts became blended and harmonized through the presence and benignant influence of the Legislator and Sage of the Church. When seeing Bishop White with Bishop Hobart, I have often thought

of Melancthon and Luther, the one made for counsel, the other for action : the one meek, erudite, far-seeing, philosophical ; the other impulsive, bold, prompt, with a sway over men rarely surpassed.

“ His career was long, and as felicitous as long. No man had more unbroken health. The late Dr. Chapman once told me that Bishop White was the only man he had ever seen who could eat all kinds of food, at all times, and in any quantity, and do it with impunity. Born in Philadelphia, a resident of it for eighty-eight years, decided in all his opinions, religious and political, he had yet, when he came to die, no enemy, and all good men claimed to be his friends. The streets through which his remains passed were like one hall of mourning, and his picture now stands side by side with those of Washington and Lafayette in the Hall of Independence. The late Charles Chauncey, whom you knew, and whose praise is on the tongue of every Philadelphian, assured me that, though a decided Presbyterian, he and Bishop White had lived next door neighbours for a quarter of a century with no feelings but those of the frankest and warmest cordiality. They usually came out of their doors at the same time on Sunday morning, and walked together a square or two, when they separated to go to their respective places of worship. The only subject on which he ever remembered that they differed materially, was one respecting the union of different religious bodies for the publication of tracts and the establishment of Sunday Schools, and he had seen reason, since the Bishop's death, to conclude that his was the better opinion of the two.

“He was by education and temperament much averse to excitement; and yet few men saw earlier and with more complacency that an era of greater religious earnestness and activity was impending, or did more to prepare his own Communion for it. He was, from the first, a decided friend of every effort to enlist that Communion in the work of Missions, at home and abroad; and some of the strongest papers which he drew during the last few years of his life were instructions to the earliest representatives of the Episcopal Church of the United States in foreign lands. He was also devoted, from the first, to efforts for the amelioration of prison-discipline, the education of the deaf and dumb, the instruction of the blind, the reformation of abandoned women, and the care of orphans and destitute aged persons. As the early ‘guide, philosopher, and friend’ of our Episcopal Church, when it emerged, a mere wreck, from the War of Independence, we see, every year, more occasion to admire his wisdom, activity, and patience. As a theological writer he made contributions to literature more valuable than is generally known, and among his unpublished works are some abler and more elaborate than any of his yet printed, particularly a voluminous ‘Reply to Barclay’s Apology.’

“As the first Bishop of this Diocese, he gave a direction to the opinions and policy of his people, wherever he went, for which his successors will have reason to bless his memory for many generations. He was a man without guile. He was just and gentle,

yet inflexible. He lived for duty, and died in the serene hope and faith of the Gospel of Christ.”¹

The Hon. Joseph R. Ingersoll, who was a prominent Churchman in Philadelphia, and a constant hearer of the Bishop’s preaching in Old Christ Church, supplied Dr. Sprague with a lengthy account of his work as a preacher, and also furnished some details concerning him which are too important to be omitted. He says:—

“His office as a Christian minister was a pledge for continued exertions in a holy cause, and when he became a bishop, his duties were only enlarged and multiplied, without being altered in their great and solemn purpose. He was, indeed, constantly imparting instruction. His sermons, like his conduct, served, as they were meant to do, not for his own display, but for the benefit of others. In their preparation and revisal they received the advantage of unceasing reflection and study; and by purifying the hearts and enlightening the understandings of those who listened to them, he was himself a learner. His mind was stored with wisdom gathered for the benefit of mankind, and his heart was kept pure by the lessons of purity which he taught. The accumulation of his knowledge was extensive, although, in his own view, it was not collected exactly in what he would have called his study. He was practically and essentially a student, and he became wiser by his

¹ Sprague’s *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. v. pp. 285-288.

faithful endeavours to make others wise. These discourses from the pulpit derived their merit chiefly from their own innate and intrinsic wisdom and piety. No attempt was made to lend them force or impressiveness by the charms of oratory. He did not believe that gesticulation was natural to him, and no gestures were used. The sermon, in the shape of a small book, was held in the hand of the reader, and there was remarkable uniformity in its length, which appeared to be accurately measured by the number of pages devoted to the manuscript. All that could be regarded as mere manner was avoided, or at least unused. In whatever sense the lesson of the Grecian Orator may be understood, it would be difficult to give the name of action to anything that was exhibited. Yet this style, so far from ornamental, and so peculiarly marked by its simplicity, — this delivery so foreign from the arts of elocution, as they are generally practised, — did not deprive the sermons of their attractiveness. They were probably far more attractive than they would have been if attempts to adorn them with ill-adapted figures of speech, or to bestow upon them animation by more spirited delivery, had been indulged or introduced. The late Judge Washington said that he had been in the habit, during his official visits to Philadelphia, of following Bishop White from church to church, as he preached consecutively in the several united churches of which he was the rector. His discourses in the pulpit, and on other occasions of official duty, were no less sound and holy than his life was pure.

“ Precept and example were, in his preaching and living, beautiful handmaids of each other. In the tone and tendency of each there was a striking resemblance. A dignified simplicity not unequally characterized both. All of his movements, whether self-guiding, or calculated for external influence, were towards virtue. He felt little cause for self-reproof, and it scarcely occurred to him, in the gentleness of his spirit, to suspect the existence of grievous causes for rebuke in those about him. His sermons partook of instruction and guidance, rather than of censure or remonstrance. His daily habits were those of peace and good-will. With uniform cheerfulness of disposition in his own bosom, he found himself, for the most part, in the midst of corresponding cheerfulness. No one had more reason to rejoice in the influence and contagion of an amiable temper, which, while it excites no counteracting or unhappy feeling in familiar intercourse, is comparatively free from the danger of encountering it. If ever man made his own moral atmosphere, it was Bishop White. There was no austerity about him. He well knew, not only that virtues and vices are antipodes of each other, but that virtues themselves, when driven beyond their nature, lose their value and even their name. Superstition and intolerance and persecution are not piety, any more than avarice is frugality, or extravagance liberality. He used the world without abusing it. Many persons to whom written lessons might have been unknown, however salutary in their nature, saw and profited by the remarkable illustration. His own home

was the abode of a generous and well-directed hospitality, and he partook without hesitation of hospitality abroad. He was met in frequent, although not indiscriminate, social intercourse. He shared in it from principle, as well as from good feeling, believing that excess might be made less probable by the occasional or habitual presence and association of those who scrupulously avoided it. He never forgot the decorum and amiable and unaffected dignity which became his public character.

“The tendencies and habits of Bishop White did not appear to undergo any material change with his advancing years. He was ready and willing and able to put forth his mental strength as long as it should last, and it did happily last until the evening of a greatly prolonged life. His unexhausted fertility of mind and performance of duty were remarkable. It is said that the fact could scarcely be believed by his brother Churchmen in England, that the Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania preached every Sunday without fail; and when it was added that he had numbered at the time some eighty years, the feeling of incredulity became almost absolute. With all his gentle properties, he was eminently firm, when firmness was required, in supporting what he deemed right or opposing wrong. With all his habits of caution and forbearance, promptness in thought and action were not wanting when promptness became the occasion or himself. The occasion, however, seldom found his mind unprepared, and his promptness was probably less the effect of any sudden impulse or mere suggestion of

the moment, than of a previously matured and satisfactory course of comprehensive thought, which fitted him for emergencies, and accounted for his meeting and overcoming them without extraordinary effort. . . .

“ His step became less firm ; his voice less distinct and clear. Although his eye was not, for useful purposes, dimmed, yet many years had overtaken and gone by him since he had reached and triumphed over the allotted term of ordinary human existence. The foot which sustained his tall form no longer moved with a buoyant and elastic tread. It was too plain that, like a marble statue, however well proportioned, to which the skilful artist gives additional support, something was needed besides due proportion and native strength to preserve continued uprightness and steadiness to the body. Nothing was more natural than an offer from a friend of a relieving and supporting arm. Whether the offer was regarded as implying too plainly a want of confidence in his own stability, which he was not willing to admit, or the acceptance of it might be thought by him to involve some trouble to another, it was generally declined, and the unsteady gait and amiable disposition were no farther relieved or disturbed.

“ It is satisfactory to feel that the noble countenance and fine figure of Bishop White are sufficiently safe in the recollection of his contemporaries, and in the knowledge of the generation which has followed him. By an arrangement among a number of persons, an excellent picture was painted by Inman, representing him as seated in the chancel, in the act of pronounc-

ing a discourse previously to one of his Episcopal offices. The portrait was sent to England for the purpose of procuring the best possible engraving. This was executed by one of the most distinguished artists, in his happiest manner. The plan has been carried completely into effect by multiplying copies of this engraving. The form and features, once so cherished, are kept in view by many who are able to blend their belief in pious, moral, and intellectual worth of a past day, with features and expression of almost speaking benevolence and intelligence; and the memorial is held with pride and gratitude. When Pettrick, the sculptor, resided in Philadelphia, he was anxious to prepare a bust of Bishop White without giving him any trouble. He accordingly placed himself in front of the pulpit, that the lineaments and countenance of the Bishop might be seen to the best advantage; and while the venerable object of study was delivering his sermon he was unconsciously standing for his likeness. The attentive artist, meanwhile, was absorbed in his own professional contemplations, quite unmindful probably of the discourse; and having faithfully fixed his mind on the features presented to his eye, and impressed them firmly in his recollection, he retired to the seclusion of his studio, and prepared his model in the absence of the original.”¹

The late Dr. John S. Stone delivered a memorial sermon on Bishop White, in St. Paul’s Church, Boston, shortly after his death, in which he gives an incident

¹ *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. v. pp. 289-292.

that was characteristic of him and is too good to be lost. He says : "He had it in his power to take those incipient steps, which, followed up by other aspirants to enlarged authority, would have led to the ultimate establishment amongst us of a temporal headship in the Church. But, like Washington, it was his peculiar merit that he would not seize upon the opportunity with which he was presented. He was aware of our danger ; and, under God, has, it may be hoped, enabled us permanently to shun it. 'Stop,' said he, a few months before his death, to a minister who was addressing an assembly over which the venerable man presided, and who was indulging the too frequent habit of heaping upon him the epithets of 'Patriarch' and 'Father of the Church,' — 'stop ; don't call me by such names !' He seemed distinctly aware that one way in which power may alarmingly and dangerously stretch itself, is that of first permitting the names of authority and prerogative to be given it ; then, receiving apparently free concessions of their exercise ; and finally, seizing on their full energies by the strong hand of gradually acquired influence. The undimmed eye of his foresight looked into the future of our destinies. He discerned our peril ; and, acting in clear view and with a just abhorrence of the spirit which governs the above process, he steadily and to the very last put away from himself even the names of the ancient despotism in the Church."

CHAPTER XII.

THEOLOGIAN AND AUTHOR.

BISHOP WHITE, though not a professed theologian, was one of the most learned men of his day. At the beginning of the century he had a long correspondence with Dr. Joseph Priestley, who came to Philadelphia from England about the year 1795, and frequently attended public worship at Christ Church. Mutual respect and cordiality of feeling existed between them, and they were in correspondence for several years after Dr. Priestley returned to England. Bishop White was a scholarly man from his earliest years, and extended his studies to many and special departments of knowledge which were without the lines of his profession. The Bishop's library, which was all contained on the shelves occupying two walls of his study, numbered about two thousand volumes. This study was a large room in the second story of his house, and directly behind the front room which he occupied for his bed-chamber and where he died. It was warmed by an open fireplace, and the portraits upon the walls were chiefly those of the bishops in the American Church who were contemporary with himself. His favourite place for study was in front of the small table at the right side of the fireplace; and on the other side there stood an

upright desk, where he usually wrote his sermons. He used for this purpose little books of his own manufacture, which were so small that he could easily hold them in one hand when in the pulpit. His handwriting was large, uniform, and extremely legible, and he was careful in the arrangement of his papers and manuscripts, and left nothing at loose ends. Every document that had come under his notice was described and labelled so that its contents were indicated. Instances of his care in noting upon each document its proper character, are furnished in the following copies of notes made on the outside covers of two of his little manuscript books. One of them contains the following: "Remarks on a Pamphlet published by ye rev'r Benj: Allen, being an Appendage to ye Decision of ye Bps. on ye Question of ye Consecration of ye rev. Henry U. Onderdonk. If this Document should survive, I wish it never to be brought forward for ye continuance of controversy, but only to contradict misrepresentation, if made. W. W." The other has the following note on the outside: "1829. Concerning ye Question relative to ye Episcopacy which will come before ye Gen'l: Convention conformably to ye Instruction of ye Convention of the State of Virginia recorded on their Journal, page 17." This related to the election of William Meade, who had been chosen Assistant Bishop of Virginia, without the right of succession. He was equally careful in regard to all his own publications. In one of these little books is found the following paragraph: "The reason of my leaving of lists of my printed publications, small and

generally anonymous, is, that in ye event of my decease, I may guard against ye imputing to me of any other. However unimportant my name, and however improbable it's being so misused, ye bare possibility of it ought to be my justification. Wm : White."

Though the Bishop had ample time during his long life in which to prepare works of importance, it must be remembered that from an early age he was a public man and had incessant demands upon his leisure. He was the president of nearly every public institution in Philadelphia ; and at his death the number of these institutions and societies which sent in obituary resolutions, and which desired a place in his funeral procession, was something unprecedented in the United States. It is not necessary that a full list of his contributions should be here published. It was intended shortly after his death that all his principal works should be brought out in a collected form, but this has never been done. The only one which has survived and is likely to abide is the one entitled "*Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.*" This was published first in 1820, and made a work of 474 pages, 8vo. It is of priceless value from an historical point of view. When the second edition was published in 1835, the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to Dr. Francis L. Hawks : "I have been exceedingly gratified by Bishop White's attention in sending me the second edition of his '*Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.*' The work is more than ordinarily valuable as an authentic record of transactions of the

highest importance to the American Church, and as a lasting memorial of the truly Christian principles, temper, and conduct of the venerable persons, American and English, by whose prudence and piety the proceedings were brought to a happy issue." No one had a more complete knowledge of the Episcopal Church in this country down to the year 1835 than Bishop White, and his "Narrative of Events" is brought down to that year, ending with a sketch of the proceedings of the General Convention of 1835. His account is minute and authoritative, and it is believed to be strictly impartial. There is nothing like it in American ecclesiastical history, and by it Bishop White will transmit the records of his public career and of the American Episcopal Church to remote generations.

Another work, first published in 1813 and 1814 in a magazine, and brought out afterwards in one volume in 1833, is entitled "A Commentary on the Questions in the Offices for the Ordaining of Priests and Deacons; and a Commentary on the Duties of the Public Ministry." This is a companion volume to Bishop Wilberforce's "Ordination Addresses," and is still used in preparation for holy orders. In 1817 he published in two large volumes "Comparative Views of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians." This work has gone by with the theological views which it maintained. Bishop White was an Arminian as opposed to Calvinism. His most important work, the one on which he believed that his reputation as a divine would chiefly rest, is entitled "A Counter

Apology for the Divinity of the Holy Scriptures, in a Review of the Apology of Robert Barclay on the Same Subject." It was begun in the year 1805. In 1810 it was resumed, and it was completed during that and the succeeding year. It was reperused in 1826, and was further revised in 1833. The decline of the Quakers in Pennsylvania and New Jersey made the publication of this work unnecessary, and it still remains in manuscript. The following note was dated Oct. 18, 1833, and is inserted in the manuscript: "On a reperusal of the 'Counter Apology,' I see no cause to withdraw any of the arguments contained in it. Whether it will ever be published is uncertain; but I believe that it would tend to the upholding of the truths of our holy religion—first, by showing the danger of a theory, which, by affirming an imaginary light of nature under an imposing but misapplied name, leads to deism; and secondly, by distinguishing between Christian duty and requisitions foreign to it,—representing them, to young persons especially, as equally obligatory, and thus preparing their ripened understandings for an equal disregard of both." Many of his writings were contributed to the religious papers, especially those written in his old age. His five addresses to the trustees, professors, and students of the General Theological Seminary in 1823, 1824, 1827, 1828, and 1829, were all published in pamphlets, and are full of excellent advice to young ministers. He delivered also five Episcopal Charges, in 1807, 1825, 1831, 1832, and 1834, all of which were published. They took up points of discipline, Episcopacy, the legislation

of the Church, the question of Christian unity, and the subject of revivals. His first Charge was delivered in 1807. It covered the divine constitution of the Christian Church and the relation of the clergy to the Episcopate. It also set forth the order and perfections of the Church, and explained his position with reference to "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered." The second Charge, delivered in 1825, discussed the common ministry. The reason why he had for eighteen years previous delivered no charges was because he had had so many chances to speak on the ministry at ordinations that he did not think it was necessary. The Charge of 1831 was devoted to several subjects, — revivals, the unity of the Church, points of discipline, the Episcopacy, and ecclesiastical legislation. While discussing in this Charge the subject of a Bishop's Church, he said: "What to your Bishop seems the most plausible is that in a city or town of a diocese, as central as may be, there should be a church, so far differing from the churches generally as that the Bishop shall be its more immediate pastor, and that to enable him to visit his diocese, a third part of it every year, there should be an assistant presbyter or deacon." He was always careful to sustain the dignity and the rights of the Episcopate. The Charge of 1832 was delivered in a time of religious excitement, and explains the Church system as opposed to revivals. It is valuable as a statement of his principles in regard to spiritual religion. He laid down the following tests of a revival: "1. The necessity of distinguishing affections due to the Holy

Spirit from emotions coming from the animal economy. 2. The zeal should be divested of all that comes under the name of angry passion. 3. There ought to be universal attendance on the ordinances of religion. 4. The truths of the evangelical dispensation ought to be the prominent heads of instruction and edification. 5. The revival ought to be in agreement with that grace of the Christian system which binds together believers in ecclesiastical union."

These principles he had acted on for half a century, and he puts them on record, under responsibility, as the religious convictions of his life. His last Charge, delivered in 1834, was entitled "The Past and the Future." He was sensible that a man in his eighty-sixth year could not expect to address his people again, and he felt it to be his duty in meeting his Convention — the fiftieth Convention of his diocese — to pass in review the events connected with the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and the lessons which they inculcate. There is nothing here which is not to be found set forth in detail in his "Memoirs of the Church," except the large comprehensive counsels which the venerable Bishop felt that he had a right to give to the Church for the future. While nothing need be quoted from it, it must be said that it has no charity for party issues in the Church, and does not look forward to any innovations upon what has been inherited from the Church of England.

He wrote the Pastoral Letters of the House of Bishops from 1808 to 1835 inclusive, ten in all, and left

the following note concerning them : " As these letters, although in the name of a House, were known to have been written by me, and currently spoken of with that circumstance attached to them ; and as, on that account, I may be thought especially responsible for the sentiments expressed, — I have thought that it comes under the principle of these entries to take the present notice of them. The notoriety referred to does not attach to the various addresses penned by me for institutions in which I have presided, but the responsibility for which may therefore be committed to the bodies which respectively adopted them." They are couched in guarded and conservative language, more religious than ecclesiastical in tone, and are intended to express the spiritual consciousness of the Church at the time when they were put forth. It was natural that they should carry great weight throughout the American Church, and, as the words of the Presiding Bishop, they expressed his comprehensive interest in the whole Episcopal body in this country. Among the less important writings of Bishop White on theological and ecclesiastical subjects there is a remarkable correspondence which he carried on with Mr. Charles Miller, a member of King's Chapel, Boston, which seceded from the Episcopal Church in America in 1783, and whose minister, Mr. James Freeman, finding it impossible to obtain ordination at the hands of Bishop Seabury, or, later, from Bishop Provoost or Bishop White, was finally ordained by the senior warden of the parish. The reason of the defection was that the pews of the Churchmen who had gone to Nova Scotia during the Revolu-

tion were confiscated ; and the persons who had burial rights in the vaults of the Chapel, who were not in all cases accredited parishioners, were forced to act as parishioners in order to retain their rights of sepulture. This circumstance gave the majority into the hands of men who were Socinians, and thus the Chapel became the first Unitarian place of worship in America, full forty years before the Unitarians separated from the Congregational denomination. Between Mr. Miller and Bishop White an extended correspondence was maintained in 1785 and 1786, in which Dr. White did not hesitate to set forth in plain terms what he thought of these ecclesiastical proceedings.

Only two political discourses from his pen have been preserved in print, though a third still exists in manuscript. The first was preached in Christ Church, Philadelphia, on February 19th, 1795. It was on "The Reciprocal Influence of Civil Polity and Religious Duty." It was dedicated to President Washington, in whose presence it had been delivered, with a lengthy preface in praise of the religious character of his administration. The second, unpublished, was preached on the 9th of May, 1798, on the Fast Day recommended by President Washington. It was "A Retrospective View of Our Civil Origin." A considerable portion of it was afterwards inserted in the Pastoral Letter of 1826. The third sermon was on "The Duty of Civil Obedience as Required by Scripture." This was preached, April 25th, 1799, in response to a day of humiliation appointed by the President. It was first used in substance on November 5th, known before the

Revolution as "Gunpowder Day," and was afterwards preached on the Fourth of July, when the holiday fell on Sunday. It did duty for the third time in 1799. Bishop White was a Republican before the Revolution, and a stanch Federalist after the adoption of the Constitution. He continued to stand with that party as long as he lived.

In a little book entitled "Bishop White's Opinions," long since out of print, one obtains in a nutshell his theological position. He is here represented, in a compilation of his views on certain theological and ecclesiastical points, on his positive and strongest side. In this connection may be given an account of his method in the examination of candidates for holy orders. The venerable Dr. E. V. Buchanan, of Philadelphia, still living, was examined for deacon's orders in his study in 1832. It was a formidable ordeal for a young man to pass through. The Bishop sat in his armchair, a thin and tall man, cheerful, courteous, and dignified, neatly dressed, wearing black silk stockings, with silver buckles in his shoes, and the exact image of a gentleman of the old school. Ten clergymen were arranged in two rows on each side of the timid young man, and were all at liberty to ask questions. They engaged in an animated discussion over his answers, while the Bishop gave him texts for sermons, and required of him a Latin dissertation. In this connection a letter, addressed to him at this time, is printed literally, and shows how the Bishop treated his candidates for holy orders.

PHILADELPHIA, Mch. 5, 1832.

DEAR SIR, — I have received your letter of ye 2nd instant; and in consequence of it, send to you ye following texts for ye four sermons required by ye canon: Genesis xlix. 10; Isaiah ix. 6; Matt. xiii. 52; Ephesians iv. 1. For ye subject of ye Latin dissertation required, I name to you 31st Article.

Wishing you success in your studies, I am

Yours affectionately,

WM: WHITE.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE LAST YEARS.

AFTER Dr. Onderdonk had become Assistant Bishop he undertook the outside and distant work of the diocese, leaving to Bishop White, who was now an octogenarian, the work of his pastorate in Christ Church and St. Peter's parishes, and such duties as were laid upon him as the Presiding Bishop. He was beyond the period when he was good for much in the active work of the Church, but he was as sagacious in council, as wise in his judgments, and as active in intellect, as he had been in earlier life. He was at this time the full Bishop of Pennsylvania. Every one revered the tall and venerable man who walked the streets of Philadelphia with slow and measured step, and he was beloved, as never before, in his office of chief pastor and in his character as a citizen. It was remarked after his death that he was one of the three perfect men that America had so far produced, Washington and Marshall being the other two. Everybody wished to have his blessing; little children paused in the street for his kindly greeting and to pay him respect; and his weight of years and his kindness to all made him, what Bishop Fraser was recently called, "the Bishop of all denominations." That he enjoyed this

distinction is not to be doubted, but it rather increased his humility than ministered to his pride. In the councils of the Church he had the same pre-eminence. He was deferred to as the only one who had known all things from the beginning, and at the General Convention and in the public work of the Church he was the central figure and the most influential factor.

In earlier years he had trained sons in the ministry who had risen to do him honour, such men as John Henry Hobart, Jackson Kemper, William Augustus Muhlenberg, and William H. De Lancey, the last one being the assistant at St. Peter's, and already known as a man after his own heart. Bishop Hobart had been, of these earlier men, the one who stood nearest to him. In the sermon at his consecration, which, with that of Dr. Griswold, took place in 1811, he thus refers to the man who is said to have had more influence over the venerable Bishop than any one else, and to whom he looked forward as the one who would do most to repeat his work in the Church and enlarge its scope :

“As one of them until within these few days has been known only by a respectable and unblemished reputation, and by the unanimity there have been committed to him the concerns of the Church over a very extensive district, he would excuse the indulgence of personal regards ; while there is expressed peculiar satisfaction in the admission of a brother known in his infancy, in his boyhood, in his youth, and in his past labours in the ministry, to him to be the principal agent in the reception of him to the Episcopacy. There are not likely to be any within these walls who have had such ample opportunity of judging of the reverend person now referred to, as to real character and

disposition. And his ordainer can with truth declare that he shall discharge the duty on which he is soon to enter with the most sanguine prospects as to the issue. This is said without the remotest idea of a comparison with any other, but merely on account of a longer and more intimate acquaintance, and perhaps what is now announced may not be altogether without a reference to self, although — it is trusted — not operating in a faulty line. For, whether it be the infirmity of an advance in years, or, as is rather hoped, an interest taken in the future prosperity of the Church, there is cherished a satisfaction in the recollection of counsels formerly given to one who is in future to be a colleague, who may, in the common course of affairs, be expected to survive, and through whom there may accordingly be hoped to be some small measure of usefulness, when he who gave those counsels shall be no more."

The time was at hand for a new movement in the Episcopal Church in this country, and in 1832 he consecrated four men to the Episcopate who were destined to be as influential in their day in shaping the Church in the future as Bishop White and the brilliant young men whom he had instructed and inspired had been and were already in giving breadth of thought and life to the Church and variety to its ministrations. It has been the good fortune of the Episcopal Church in the United States to have had some of its greatest men in the Episcopate, and when George Washington Doane and Charles Pettit McIlvaine and Benjamin Bosworth Smith and John Henry Hopkins were consecrated as bishops in that year — each one a man of strength in a special direction — the Church took on a wider character and opened to a greater outlook than it had

before. In Hobart and Kemper and Muhlenberg, Bishop White had spoken to a generation that had come into existence since he had reached middle life ; and in these new men, none of whom had been directly under his influence, but all of whom had been lifted up by his spirit, he found those who were representing the larger life upon which the Episcopal Church was now entering. Bishop Doane was to illustrate in New Jersey the spirit which Bishop Hobart had manifested in New York ; Bishop McIlvaine was to succeed the eccentric and indefatigable Bishop Chase, who had resigned his work in Ohio rather than be subjected to the criticism of his peers ; Bishop Smith was to be the pioneer of the Church in what was then almost the wilderness diocese of Kentucky ; and Dr. Hopkins was to be the first Bishop of Vermont, and manifest his genius, "cribbed, cabined, and confined," among its hillside farms.

It was a time of great stir in the world outside. Goethe had finished his work and had just died ; Coleridge was pouring forth his mystical philosophy at Highgate, and Carlyle and Emerson were finding in him and in Wordsworth the prophets of the new day ; in religion the Tractarian Movement had just begun to engage the minds of the Oxford Church leaders, and Newman had written the first of the "Tracts for the Times." In this country the Unitarians had captured Massachusetts and were attempting to make headway in Connecticut, where the milder spirit of the Episcopal Church had absorbed into its fold the men and women who, in the Bay State, had found a congenial

field for their reaction from the New England theology in a more radical religious system. Within three years from the consecration of these men the Episcopal Church was to declare, in the Convention of 1835, — the one at which Bishop White bade farewell to his brethren, — that the whole body of baptized Christians was the missionary army of the Church of Christ, and to organize itself for aggressive work both at home and abroad, as a committee of the whole. It was a time when men's hearts were large because their thoughts were high and noble, and it was a fitting season for this Patriarch of the American Church to

“Fold his tent, like the Arabs,
And as silently steal away.”

Bishop White had but recently entered upon his eighty-ninth year. In spite of his great age, he still insisted on preaching every Sunday in one of the churches of which he was the rector. His last sermon was preached on June 26th, and is entered in his record of sermons for the Sunday as follows: “Of ye Sword of ye Gospel, Heb. iv. 12.” In the same book the dates of the next to his last sermons are May 22d and 29th, June 5th and 12th; and previous to this date the record shows that, with the exception of four or five Sundays, he had preached regularly from the beginning of the year. The last official act which he performed was on the Fourth of July, when he affixed his signature to the document authorizing the consecration of the Rev. Samuel A. McCoskry to the office of Bishop of Michigan. This was the only consecration to the Episcopate in which he did not have a part during his long career.

The details of his last illness were written out at length by one who was constantly with him, and were afterwards published in the paper called "The Missionary." They furnish the only existing account of his last days. The writer, after alluding to the fact that little more than three months before he had entered upon his eighty-ninth year, says : —

"Though since then he had been visited with a severe attack of sickness, which at the time caused great anxiety, he had so far recovered as to appear at the meeting of the bishops, on the 21st day of June, with even more than his wonted strength of body and clearness and activity of mind. He continued thus in the discharge of his accustomed duties with his accustomed industry and assiduity, — contributing to the last, or July number, of the 'Protestant Episcopalian,' a most remarkable article on the wanderings of the mind in prayer ; keeping up the current of his extensive correspondence ; preaching in St. Peter's Church on Sunday, June 26th, the last time, 'the word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart ;' and on Saturday, July 2d, attending a funeral, and visiting, in a distant part of the city, a member of his congregation. In the evening of that day, however, he was evidently feeble, and retired to rest without disease, but much exhausted. It was the last time that he ascended the familiar stairs. A fall, on rising in the course of the night, alarmed his watchful and devoted son, who found him prostrate on the floor ; and from that time, though without other injury from the fall (which was the effect, it is supposed, of weakness merely) than external bruises, he gradually sunk, from the slow failure, one by one, of all the springs of life, — without pain,

without severity of suffering, without a murmur or a groan, — until the fifteenth day of his confinement, when, sweetly as an infant drops away upon its mother's breast, he slept in Jesus.

“It was on Tuesday, July 12th, that the administration of the Communion of the Sick was proposed to him; to which he gave, with great emphasis of manner, the most cordial assent, spontaneously observing that it was an ordinance significant of all that was most essential in Christianity, and expressing the devout hope that he might have grace to receive it with resignation and to his spiritual profit. It was accordingly administered by the Assistant Bishop, there being present with him all members of the family, another Bishop, and the assistant minister of St. Peter's Church. It was astonishing, in his great weakness of body, to see with what strength and fervour he engaged in the solemn service, and how perfectly his attention and interest were sustained throughout. His manner was that of deep and seraphic devotion, — following evidently through all the prayers, uniting distinctly in every sentence that was responsive, and most especially in the Confession and in the Gloria in Excelsis, sealing every portion of the service with an emphatic ‘Amen’; and when the consecrated elements were delivered to him, insisting earnestly, until over-persuaded by those about him, that he could rise from the bed, which for several days he had not left, to receive them, as he was used to do, on his knees.

“From the commencement of the Bishop's illness, though every office was performed with the utmost skill and assiduity and tenderness by the members of his family, it had been conceded to the affectionate interest of the clergy that there should be some of them in the house every night. On Tuesday night that pleasure — and greater pleasure there could scarcely be — was shared by the Bishop of New Jersey, with his brother of Michigan.

Though it could not reasonably be doubted that the venerable patient was acquainted with his true condition and its unquestionable result, it was deemed kind and just — with that respectful tenderness which was not more strongly dictated by the relation of the parties than by the impulses of filial feeling — to seek assurance that it was so, and to afford the opportunity for any communication which he might desire to make, and which, ere long, increasing weakness might preclude. Accordingly, at a favourable opportunity during the night, it was said to him: ‘I hope, sir, that you feel no inconvenience from the effort you made in receiving the Holy Communion this afternoon.’ ‘Not the least,’ he replied, ‘not the least; but much comforted.’ ‘It was a great pleasure, sir, to be permitted once more to receive that blessed sacrament which we have so often partaken with you.’ ‘And a great pleasure to me to have you.’ ‘We feel, sir, that you are very sick, very sick, indeed.’ ‘I can say nothing to the contrary of that.’ ‘We thought, sir, that you might have something that you would wish to communicate, some message for the Church, to which God has spared you so long. We should be glad to receive any word of counsel from you, and to bear it to our brethren.’ ‘I can only say that I pray God’s protection and blessing that it may continue to have peace and prosperity after my decease.’ ‘We trust, sir, that you rely with entire confidence on the promises of that blessed Gospel which you have preached so many years —’ ‘And,’ he interrupted, ‘which has hitherto sustained me.’ ‘And you submit yourself, sir, wholly to God’s gracious goodness, with a single and entire reliance for salvation on the merits of his Son, through faith in him?’ ‘Oh, entirely, entirely; I have no other wish, no other hope!’ After a pause, the effort of speaking being very great, though he did not allow that he was fatigued by it, and was evidently consoled and animated by the conversation, ‘I should be

glad,' he said, 'to express my feelings to you in some of the Psalms and Hymns, but I cannot.' 'Perhaps you would like to hear some of them read.' 'I should.' 'Will you select one, sir?' 'No; I leave it to you.' 'But you have some favourite, sir, which you would prefer.' The 209th hymn was then named by him:—

‘Thou art the way—to Thee alone
From sin and death we flee;
And he who would the Father seek,
Must seek him, Lord, by ‘Thee,’—

which was accordingly read. Having signified his entire assent and approbation of it, he said: ‘That beautiful hymn of Addison’s has been a favourite with me all my life.’ He was asked if he meant that which begins,—

‘When all Thy mercies, O my God,
My rising soul surveys,’—

and signifying that it was, the whole of it was read. He followed it throughout with the motion of his lips; and when it was done, in reply to the remark, ‘How comfortable it must be to you, sir, to realize thus the protecting care of God in life, in death, and beyond the grave,’ he said, with a warmth of expression not usual with him: ‘Oh, it is charming, it is charming!’ The fear that his feeble strength might be overdrawn here interrupted this delightful conversation, which he was evidently willing to continue. There was no subsequent opportunity afforded; but it suffices abundantly to show that as he lived so he died, in calm and meek reliance on his Saviour. Early the next morning he was asked if he remembered Bishop Ken’s beautiful Morning Hymn, and at his request a part of it was read to him, and prayers were said at his bedside; in which, though very weak, he heartily united.

“He continued gradually failing, his nights restless and his days wearisome, saying scarcely anything, yet recogniz-

ing all his friends, and replying always to their inquiry that he did not suffer, until Saturday, the 16th, when it became apparent that a great change had taken place, and that 'the solemn crisis of departing life,' to use his own most beautiful expression in the recent Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops, was near at hand. About two o'clock of that day, when he seemed at the lowest point of physical exhaustion, and his weeping family expected his immediate dissolution, on the approach of the present writer to his bedside, mindful to the last of the courtesy which graced his life, he addressed him with the accustomed inquiry, by name, shortly after which he asked that prayers might be offered. A considerable portion of the order for the Visitation of the Sick, was immediately used, with eminent propriety and feeling, by the assistant minister of St. Peter's Church, humbly commending 'the soul of this thy servant, our dear father, into thy hands, as into the hands of a faithful Creator and merciful Saviour.' Although, after this service, the saintly sufferer revived a little, and continued, until within an hour or two of his decease, to recognize his brethren and friends who came about him, there was no distinctive act subsequent to this. His last request, as became a Christian believer, was for prayer to God. His last act, as became a Christian Bishop, was the commendation of his soul to God in the office of his Church.

"In the time and circumstances of his death, as in the course of his long life, there was a beautiful propriety. His alarming illness was extensively known. All the periodicals of the Church, and many of the secular newspapers, had expressed concern for its issue. The result was, as in the case of another apostle in a condition of imminent peril, 'prayer was made without ceasing of the Church unto God for him.' Especially was this the case on the second Lord's Day after his sickness commenced, the seventh Sunday after Trinity, and the 17th day of

July; on which day the various Episcopal congregations in several of the dioceses, 'were uniting their voices on behalf of the venerable Patriarch in the beautiful supplication of their ritual, for a sick person.' Upon this sacred day, whose solemn services for nearly seventy years had seldom failed to engage his voice in the several offices of the Christian ministry, as the hour of noon approached, when the prayers of faithful thousands had but just gone up to heaven in intercession for him, the day itself —

‘ So calm, so cool, so bright,
The bridal of the earth and sky,’

in the house which for half a century had been his home, in his own chamber, upon his own bed, with all his loved ones of the first and second generation gathered round him, so quietly that not a murmur caught the quickened sense of love's most practised ear, so gently that the most attentive eye marked not the moment of its transit, his peaceful spirit took its flight from earth, — washed, as we humbly trust, from all defilements, ‘in the blood of that immaculate Lamb, which was slain to take away the sins of the world,’ — to be ‘presented pure and without spot’ before God. Beautiful instance of the only true, the Christian euthanasia! Beautiful termination of a life, which faith and holiness and charity had made instinct and radiant with beauty! Beautiful illustration of the power of our religion to adorn and bless the longest life, to console, to strengthen, to make conqueror in death! Beautiful copy of a perfect Exemplar — may we follow thee as thou hast followed Christ, live near to him as thou hast lived in the meek piety of thy life, go to him as thou hast gone in the calm confidence of thy triumphant death!”

It had long been the express desire of the aged Bishop that he might be permitted to depart this life on the Lord's Day, and his wish was granted. He passed away at a quarter before twelve o'clock, and the

fact of his decease was announced in the city churches in the afternoon, immediately after the evening service preceding the sermon, accompanied by a request that the sermon should be omitted, in compliance with an arrangement which had been made by some of the clergy attending upon the Bishop. This request was generally regarded, and a short address suited to the occasion was made instead of the usual sermon, and the congregations were dismissed with the Apostolic benediction.

His funeral took place on Wednesday morning at ten o'clock. It was a funeral service only surpassed by that of Franklin half a century earlier. At an early hour the street in which he resided was thronged with crowds eager to catch a glimpse of the features of one whom everybody esteemed, and at the hour appointed for the service it was with difficulty that his house could be approached by those who were invited to meet at the Bishop's and the adjacent houses. At a few moments past eleven o'clock, the procession began to be formed in the following order : —

Sextons.

OFFICIATING CLERGY :

Rev. George Sheets,
Rev. W. H. De Lancey,
Rev. John W. James.

BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE :

Rt. Rev. Henry W. Onderdonk.

Rev. Levi Bull,	} BIER.	{	Rev. Dr. Abercrombie,
Rt. Rev. Bishop McCos-			Rt. Rev. Jackson Kemper,
kry,			Rt. Rev. Bishop Bowen,
Rt. Rev. Bishop Doane,			Pall-bearers.
Pall-bearers,			

Family.

Physician to the Family.

Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as Mourners.

Wardens of Christ Church, St. Peter's, and St. James's,
as Mourners.

Vestrymen of the same, as Mourners.

Standing Committee of the Diocese of Pennsylvania,
as Mourners.

The Clergy of various denominations.

Wardens and Vestrymen of the Protestant Episcopal
Churches.

Candidates for Holy Orders.

Trustees and Faculties of University of Pennsylvania.

Judges of the United States and State Courts.

American Philosophical Society.

Mayor, Recorder, and Aldermen.

Select and Common Councils.

Protestant Episcopal Academy.

Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Penn-
sylvania.

Protestant Episcopal Diocesan Sunday School Society.

Bishop White Prayer Book Society.

Philadelphia Bible Society.

Prison Discipline Society.

Pennsylvania Institution for the Deaf and Dumb.

Institution for the Blind.

Philadelphia Dispensary.

Other Institutions with which the Bishop was connected.

Episcopalians.

Citizens.

Every Christian denomination was represented in the cortege, and the procession of persons in it, which extended about two thousand feet, exclusive of the numerous carriages in attendance, formed but a small part of the immense concourse of persons, who were col-

lected to the number of upwards of twenty thousand to participate in the mournful service. Among the Bishops present were Dr. Bowen of South Carolina, Dr. Onderdonk of Pennsylvania, Dr. Kemper, Missionary Bishop of Missouri and Indiana, and Dr. McCoskry, the newly consecrated Bishop of Michigan. The pall-bearers were Bishops Bowen, Doane, Kemper, and McCoskry, assisted by the two oldest presbyters present, the Rev. Dr. Abercrombie and the Rev. Levi Bull. All the Episcopal clergy were robed in their surplices and attended as mourners. A large number of the city clergy wore, in addition to their robes, a black scarf as a badge of mourning. Besides the Episcopal clergy, there were present many ministers of other Christian bodies. Nearly the whole of Christ Church was undergoing extensive repairs at the time of the Bishop's death. He had begged the vestry to defer them until he should pass away; and it was in the midst of these repairs that the building was required for his funeral service. When the procession arrived at Christ Church, the street was so crowded with people that it was impossible to advance until orders had been given to make room for it. The body of the venerable man was at length brought in and placed in the middle aisle, before the chancel. It was covered with a black pall, thrown over a white linen covering. As the bearers proceeded up the aisle, the burial anthem was read alternately by the minister officiating and by the people. The Rev. Mr. De Lancey had charge of the services in the Church and at the grave. The sermon was preached by Bishop Onderdonk, who

now entered upon the full duties of the Episcopate. After the discourse was over, the company proceeded to the family vault in the churchyard, where the remains of the Bishop's wife had been placed over fifty years earlier, and where he had desired that his own body might be placed. A solemn hush and awe pervaded those who were present. It was as if the silence of the grave had settled upon the lips of the by-standers, and the only sounds, after the service at the grave was ended, were the stifled sobbings of those who could not restrain their grief.

Business was generally suspended in Philadelphia during the funeral, and the New York firemen, then in the city, would have participated in the procession if they had not asked this privilege at too late an hour. It was an occasion that profoundly moved the people of Philadelphia and of the surrounding country. Since the death of Washington the bells of Christ Church had not tolled a more melancholy peal than that which reached the ears of the citizens on the Sunday that Bishop White passed away. He seemed to be an essential part of the population. The office and the man were inextricably blended, and the man was everywhere beloved. The universal feeling, as expressed at the time, was: "That reverend figure, that gray head, so familiar, so honoured, will never be seen in the streets of Philadelphia again." He was the last connecting link between the people of that day and the great men of the Revolution. The words uttered by Bishop White at the consecration of Dr. Onderdonk in this ancient edifice, recounting his own earlier mem-

ories of the place in connection with the work of his life, bring to a fitting close the story of his last years. Quaintly and modestly he says of himself:—

“He feels the full weight of an occasion, reminding him of his near approach to the end of the ministry in which he has been so long a labourer: and when, during the transaction in which we have been engaged, he occasionally permitted his eye to rest on the spot, within the distance of a few feet, where, in the days of his boyhood, he joined in religious services within these walls; when from that spot his attention was transferred to the pulpit at his elbow, from which, although not unfavoured by domestic instruction and encouragement, there sunk into his youthful mind the truths of the ever-blessed gospel, and from which for the space of fifty-five years he has been proclaiming the same truths, with what effect will not be known until the day which shall ‘try every man’s work of what sort it is,’ but certainly with effect far short of his wishes and of his prayers,—there results from these recollections and from others a most weighty sense of the responsibility on which he has been so long acting; and of his need of the mercy of God, through the merits of the Redeemer, for many failures and imperfections, and for a falling short of his labours, however sincere in their principle, of what might have been accomplished by a more diligent improvement of the opportunities with which a beneficent Providence had furnished him.”

CHAPTER XIV.

A HALF CENTURY OF CHURCH LIFE.

THE personal career of Bishop White was unique among Americans. Younger in years than most of the men with whom he was associated, he was from the first their peer in range of outlook, in ability to see what ought to be done, and in ripe and comprehensive judgment. He had the statesman's gift of working wisely when he had a great end in view. No other man appeared among Churchmen in the American colonies who had the same ability at a great crisis to decide promptly what to do and how to do it. When he was hardly thirty-five years of age, with the exception of Dr. Seabury, he was the most conspicuous clergyman, the one to whom all eyes instinctively turned in the American colonies. He had made the impression of a man who had the qualities and gifts of leadership, though he had not been called upon to show forth all that he could do. His wealth, his social position, his thorough education, and a certain maturity of mind and thought which impressed all who came in contact with him, contributed to his eminence. Though the junior of Washington in years, he was not only his pastor but his equal in social rank and distinction. In any community Bishop White would have

been a man of note, and in the political and religious crisis which was brought to a head in the American Revolution he had the qualities of courage and foresight which made him a man of mark.

He was born to enjoy the confidence of his fellow-men, and exercise leadership over them. He did this not by assuming to lead, but by the superiority of his gifts, which impressed all who came in contact with him. He gained the confidence of others by their conviction of his largeness of mind and heart. He lived in many respects a double life. In one character he fulfilled his round of duty as the Bishop of Pennsylvania and the rector of the united churches in Philadelphia, and in these positions he felt most at home. In the other character he stood forth as the patriarch of the American Church, the one man who had a full knowledge of the Anglican Church in the United States from the beginning, and to whom all momentous questions in ecclesiastical affairs were constantly referred as they arose. He took the initiative in the organization of the American Church. Undoubtedly this was in part forced upon him by his official position in Philadelphia, but he could never have obtained the immediate recognition he did among all the scattered parishes along the Atlantic seaboard, if he had not impressed himself upon the minds of others as one in whom they could place trust as a wise and prudent leader in ecclesiastical affairs. No other man, except Bishop Seabury, attained anything like the same eminence or the respect which was conceded to him; and many as were sharers in the re-organization of the

Church upon an American basis, he was the one man whose opinion carried most weight in the decision of what ought to be done.

Several things are to be noted in his attitude at the crisis of Episcopacy in the new world. He looked over the field and saw the Church as a whole, — its needs, its possibilities, its distinctly American position. He was not so intent upon what he held to be the truth that he could not waive an interest temporarily in order to gain a larger end. His action at a critical moment in the history of the country was as magnanimous as it was courageous and comprehensive. When it seemed as if in the height of the conflict no settlement would be reached between the contending parties, he embodied in a pamphlet, which has the first historical value in being a witness to his Catholic spirit and largeness of mind, — “*The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered*,” — the plan of a possible organization which could be accepted as provisional until the full Apostolic Succession could be obtained. Happily, in the cessation of hostilities between this country and Great Britain almost at the moment when it was first put into circulation, the reason for the views which he tentatively advocated was superseded by the possibility that the Succession could be obtained in time from the English Church ; but this does not diminish the courage and foresight of this young clergyman in devising measures by which the Church in the American colonies could be held together, and its services maintained, until there should be a favourable change in public affairs.

The man who wrote this pamphlet had a free mind. He was not bound to precedent, and the fact that in it much which is embodied in the constitution and government of the Episcopal Church in this country to-day was now outlined for the first time, shows how distinctly he had thought for himself in ecclesiastical matters. It is not simply his use of Hooker's argument for a departure from the Episcopal system under the "exigence of necessity" which attracts attention to this pamphlet, but the largeness of his views of the way in which ecclesiastical government could be accommodated to the life of the people. He here gave the first interpretation of the Church system under the light of American ideas. It is true that many features of the English Church immediately disappear when the connection with the state ceases, but Bishop White went further than this. He made it manifest to his countrymen that the Communion to which he belonged was a purely spiritual body, and that its only reason for an existence in this country was based on spiritual grounds. It was a long time before the prejudices existing against the American Church as a part of the English Communion, embittered by the political animosities of the Revolution, were allayed so that Bishop White's comprehension of what an American Episcopal organization ought to be could be widely understood; but to one looking back to the way in which he dealt with great issues and accommodated the Episcopal system to the democratic ideas found in the American government and the thoughts of the people, it is the mark

of unusual independence of mind and breadth of view that Bishop White should from the beginning have so clearly understood the situation, and laid down fundamental principles with a large comprehension of the working of a voluntary ecclesiastical body among a free people. He was not the slave of his prejudices, and he had the wisdom to act with the whole situation in view.

In the organization of other religious bodies there was nothing to change when they took shape in the American colonies. They were voluntary bodies, and what they were doctrinally in the old country they were here ; but when the Anglican Communion became an affiliated body with the Mother Church, it was made independent of it, so that the book of worship, the canons, the government, and even the constitution, though maintaining the same principles, were adapted to a freer political and social and religious life. No estimate of Bishop White's life-work would be complete which did not recognize his loyalty to American ideas and his equal loyalty to the religious body in which he was permitted to serve. It is undoubtedly largely owing to him that the Episcopal clergy and people have always agreed to keep political contentions out of their religious work. The question is never asked whether a man belongs to one party or to another. His loyalty to the nation is taken for granted, and it is believed that this may be honestly expressed in the dominant ideas which are at the basis of each political constituency. This freedom from political connections did not have any influence in favour of the Church, but it gave

its pulpit a dignity, and its proceedings and services a wholesome character which came to be widely appreciated, and which toward the end of Bishop White's career had a great deal to do with its wider growth.

One of the drawbacks which he had to contend with was the barrenness and sterility of the American people in their forms of worship. The stately ritual of the Church of England was very much shorn of its beauty and majesty by its limitation to a severe simplicity of treatment. This was also in part due to the neglect of discipline, which was one of the great drawbacks which had to be contended with in those days, and could only be gradually overcome. The American ritual was cold and bare in the light of the worship of to-day, and more people became Churchmen through their intellectual convictions than from a sympathetic appreciation of the worship. The very simplicity of the Episcopal service in the years succeeding the Revolution afterward became a drawback in the spiritual enjoyment of the services by communicants, and it is to be doubted whether Bishop White ever knew the full beauty of the English ritual as conducted in an American parish church. On another point Bishop White took a stand that commended him to the sober and candid judgment of intelligent people. He had to assert himself against the popular religious errors and enthusiasms of the day, and to incur the enmity of many good people who carried their ideas to extremes, and whom he did not wish to offend. The pathway of a Bishop in those days was not a pathway of roses, and it required all

the personal popularity enjoyed by Dr. White to make his position tolerable while he was standing up for social and moral truth as he understood it. He had to educate and develop conservative opinion for the country at large, and it required constant vigilance in one who held the office of Presiding Bishop in the United States to give the right tone to the religious sentiment of the country. Not that the influence of the Episcopal Church in those days was extensive enough to make its influence widely felt as a public educator; but to the extent of his ability and opportunity Bishop White stood on the wholesome and right side of all the great issues of the day. He never allowed the man to be overcome by the ecclesiastic.

The personal life and the public career of such a leader are always inextricably blended; and Bishop White was so large a figure in ecclesiastical affairs in the later years of the last and in the earlier part of the present century, that it is almost impossible to see or think of him apart from his public duties. He was a leader whose influence was universally felt, though he did not often put himself forward in a public capacity outside of ecclesiastical affairs. He was rather the power behind the throne than a visible functionary. He never sought to attract attention to himself on account of his office, and this caused him to be all the better appreciated where the importance of his office was understood. In those earlier days patience was a virtue to be valued, and it must have seemed to Bishop White as it did to some of the Jewish prophets that

he would never see the vision of the Lord in his day. The virtue in his patience was that he never despaired ; he made the most of such opportunities as came to him, and especially, utilized the abilities of the bright men who were under his influence, for the extension of the kind of work which was most important for the interests of the Church. Though a diocesan Bishop simply, he was also the pastor of the whole Church ; he did not feel satisfied until he had done something to advance domestic as well as foreign missions, and his mind and heart went out to the country at large and to the whole world.

It was a notable event when in 1811 Bishop White, as Presiding Bishop, consecrated two men in the prime of life who were to be associated with him in the active development of the Church in the next generation, — Dr. John Henry Hobart and Dr. Alexander Viets Griswold. They were men utterly unlike in temperament, in intellect, and in their way of looking at things, but each had the natural qualities of leadership. Dr. Hobart was consecrated for the diocese of New York, and entered upon his duties when the first demand was felt for an advance in American Churchmanship. He had the instincts of a great Churchman, and his distinction was that he founded institutions and insisted upon the doctrinal and ecclesiastical principles which were in accordance with his own Communion. He was a worker rather than a scholar, and excelled in the preparation of manuals of Christian teaching which have been largely instrumental in educating two generations of American Churchmen.

While he stood faithfully by Bishop White, he was evidently a better Churchman than his teacher, who greatly admired the way in which he lifted the religious system of the Church to a higher plane than that to which he was able to raise it in the different religious atmosphere of Philadelphia. Bishop Hobart made himself felt aggressively, and was the first American ecclesiastic to engage the Presbyterians in controversy over the authority of the ministry. He was the highest Churchman then known in the United States.

Dr. Griswold, as Bishop of the Eastern diocese, was as well fitted for his very different field as Dr. Hobart was for the New York diocese. He had to encounter a more bitter and more determined opposition to the Episcopacy than existed anywhere else in the country, but he met it with the mildness and gentleness of spirit which gave Bishop White a large part of his power in Pennsylvania. His strength was mainly to sit still and wait for time to change the hearts of the people. He had to break down the traditional prejudice of New England against Episcopacy, and his chief work was to make an impression for the Church on its spiritual side. His Episcopate of over thirty years was an unwearied effort to do what he was not able to do; and yet his life-work carried a weight in New England in Christian wisdom and sagacity that has been felt down to our own time, and probably did more to bring the Episcopal Church into its present favour in New England than any other influence exerted during his generation. These two men illustrated different types of leadership, and pointed out how differ-

ent schools of thought were allowed recognition and toleration. Dr. Hobart was an advanced man; Dr. Griswold was a mild Evangelical; and yet both stood upon the same basis of essential principles.

It is no injustice to others to ascribe the widening out of the Episcopal Church during the first quarter of this century largely to the oversight and rare wisdom of Bishop White. Never from the moment of his consecration was he allowed to stand strictly in the position of a diocesan Bishop. He was the representative man in the General Convention, in conferences, in consultations with the Bishops; and the ecclesiastical policy adopted in all these years was largely the result of his suggestions and advice. To appreciate the full extent of his work one must study carefully his "Memoirs of the Church" and enter into a knowledge of his personal life. He constantly held the post of responsibility. In fact, he was discharging the duties of three men at one and the same time. He was the rector of the largest parish in his diocese. He was responsible for the whole of Pennsylvania. He was also the Patriarch of the American Church. After his judgment and experience, his genuine gift of statesmanship was of great service. One notes in examining his private papers the care with which he attended to the duties of the office of Presiding Bishop, and sees in him, though advanced in years, a man whose thought and spirit expanded as the Church widened its scope and influence. The questions which have arisen in the half century since his death were mostly anticipated during his own lifetime.

There is always a close relation between an institution and the man who is so identified with it that in his generation he represents a large part of it. It is impossible to think of Methodism without bringing John Wesley into view, and even at the distance of a century from his death the working habits of the Methodist body bear the impress of his plain living and high thinking. The same is true of the relation in which Bishop White stands to the Episcopal Church in the United States. As in the case of Wesley, he is less quoted or referred to than formerly ; but the religious historian is able to trace his guiding hand and controlling thought, not only in his Pastoral Letters, but in the living for breadth and Catholicity which have been the watchwords of the American Church from the beginning. He had the largeness of mind which is able to decide correctly what shall be done at critical times, and yet he was not a conventional nor an easily-yielding man. He was always looking out for the larger Church, the larger field, the larger opportunity. The same readiness to meet an emergency which characterized him in the years that followed the Revolution was natural to him through life. He had the ability to see special occasions in the light of universal principles, and his action, though conservative, was never unintelligent. It was of the greatest value, that one mind, and that a mind of singular breadth and fairness, should have had so much to do with the beginnings of the Episcopal Church in this country. The opportunities were many in which a rash leader might have ruined it, but no unwise step has been traced to

Bishop White, and his advances were so carefully and shrewdly planned that few things went wrong.

It was inevitable from the nature of its beginning that the Episcopal Church should have a hard struggle to establish itself in this country, and to develop into the proportions of a large and aggressive body. It was long in presenting itself in a winning attitude to the nation, and its history had been one in which the changes made in the Church of England have mostly been repeated with variations on American soil. Bishop White's distinct achievement was that he helped greatly to establish the Church on a thoroughly American basis, and that he did not think it should be a solemn echo of the English body. He did not wish it different in its main principles, but he had no desire to accept things simply because they were done in England. A powerful influence was exerted by him in insisting that the American Communion should be as distinct in its characteristic lines of operation as it could be and still be under the control of the same principles. He stood for ecclesiastical flexibility. Under him the Church followed an American spirit and method. He was perhaps the most comprehensive of all our ecclesiastical leaders, and the bishops who have chiefly left their mark in the enlarged life of the Church have worked essentially upon the lines which he laid down. They have stood for the whole organization, with the belief that liberty under law should be the rule of healthy growth. The five bishops who were consecrated by him in 1832 and 1835 — the third generation who represent the shaping influence of this

venerable leader — were men who in critical times had the same care for the corporate life of the Church which he manifested, and they presented it to our own generation under the lead of the principles which Bishop White guarded and protected as long as he lived.

APPENDIX.

THE following statement, made by the great-grandson of Bishop White, shows the reverent care which the family have given to his remains, and has a personal interest, in connection with his biography. It is furnished by the kindness of Mr. Thomas H. Montgomery : —

PHILADELPHIA, St. Barnabas' Day, June 11, 1870.

In digging for the foundation walls of the new Parish Building, at Christ Church, it became necessary to take down the western wall of the family vault of Robert Morris and the Rt. Rev. William White, D.D. An inspection of the vault, on a previous occasion, showed that several of the cases needed care. Twenty-five years ago new cedar cases had been provided for all the coffins which required them ; but an examination at this time showed the necessity of again resorting to the same means of protection. Accordingly, in company with my cousin, Thomas H. Montgomery, the work was this day completed, and with all the care which love and reverence could suggest.

A few memoranda of what we witnessed and of what was done are here recorded. The remains of my sisters, — to wit, Mary H. Bronson and Mrs. H. A. Miller, — together with those of two of my nephews, viz., William White and Alfred A. Miller, were deposited in a new case, with the plates tacked upon the lid. The remains of my father and mother, Enos and Mary Bronson, — and of a

very small child, probably Bird Wilson Bronson, were placed together in a new case and designated as above. Those of Uncle and Aunt Morris were placed together in a new case. Those of Caroline, wife of Robert Morris, M.D., were placed in a new case; and in the same a few loose bones of an adult, which could not be identified. The same is to be said of Aunt Macpherson and of Grandpapa; each was placed in a separate case and marked. The remains of Aunt White, wife of Thomas H. White; also of William, son of Grandpapa; also of A. H. and Charles Eugene, sons of George H. White; also George Brinton, son of William White, Jr., — were put into a new case and marked. Lastly, the remains of Miss Lewis, great-granddaughter of Mrs. Gen. Washington, were recased. In all eight new cases were provided. No other cases were touched, they not requiring removal as yet. The entire skeletons of my sister, Mrs. Miller, and of her son William, were in an admirable state of preservation. The head of my mother was covered with hair, — a portion of which I preserved, — but the bones of the head had crumbled. Hair was also distinctly recognizable about the head of Robert Morris, a small portion of which was preserved. The same may be said of the crumbling skull of Grandpapa, a few hairs of which were preserved by Thomas H. Montgomery.

The entire skeleton of Grandpapa could be distinctly traced, the continuity of the extended body, even to the fingers, being undisturbed; the bones of the head alone crumbling. The velvet cap, in which the head had reposed, was entire, the texture apparently as firm as it had ever been. And the Episcopal robes, all save the lawn, lay in graceful folds, as when the body was originally prepared for burial. The colour had changed to a brownish hue, but the texture appeared to be perfect, having lost none of its strength. I preserved a small piece of the stole, and also

removed, and now have, the silver plate which had fallen in with the lid of the coffin upon the remains. This plate, heavily gilded, and almost free from tarnish, was inscribed as follows: —

RT. REV. WILLIAM WHITE, D D.,
Bishop of the Prot. Epis. Church of the
Diocese of Penn^a,
Died July 17th, 1836,
Aged 88 Yrs. 3 Months, & 13 Days.

It was deemed proper to secure this plate for use upon a new coffin when provided.

To the best of my recollection, the above embraces all that need be recorded of this painful, yet sacred work, in the care of the bodies of God's Saints.

WILLIAM WHITE BRONSON.

I fully concur in the account given above by my cousin.

THOMAS H. MONTGOMERY.

INDEX.

- ALEXANDRIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, origin of, 119, 120.
- CHASE, Philander, Bishop, p. 99, his career, 110-113; work in Ohio, 122, 123.
- Christ Church Parish, origin of, 25; reference to it as his religious home, 179.
- Church in the Revolution, 32-34.
- Churchman, Low, origin of name, 126-129; end of the party, 134.
- College of Philadelphia, changed to University of Pennsylvania, 35.
- DE LANCEY, Rev. W. H., his pamphlets in behalf of Bishop White, 131, 132.
- Duché, Rev. Mr., his rectorship of Christ Church, 18; his mystical studies, 19; forced to go to England, 32; his return, 35.
- EASTERN DIOCESE, why formed, 113.
- Episcopal Church in America, first steps in organizing of, 41-44; organizing in Connecticut, 44; different influences controlling it in the country, 47; laity admitted to the legislative body, 49, 61; feebleness of, after the Revolution, 90-92; first signs of strength, 99, 100; growth in New England, 116, 117; dates of first organization in new dioceses, 124.
- GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, origin of, 118, 119.
- Goldsmith, Oliver, met by Mr. White in London, 23, 24.
- Green, William Mercer, Bishop, farewell to Convention of 1883, 125.
- Griswold, Alexander Viets, Bishop, 99; sketch of his life and work, 113-117.
- HARRISON, Mary, wife of Bishop White, 27; early death, 27.
- Hobart, John Henry, Bishop, 99; sketch of his life and work, 107-110.
- House of Bishops, origin of, 61-63.
- INGERSOLL, Joseph R., Hon., reminiscences of Bishop White, 146-151.
- JOHNSON, Samuel, Dr., meets Mr. White in England, 23.
- KEMPER, Jackson, Bishop, 99; under Bishop White's direction, and as missionary bishop of the Northwest, 101-103.
- MADISON, James, Bishop, 92; advises union with Methodists, 95.
- Methodists, American, efforts at union with the Church made by Dr. Coke, 93-95; causes of failure, 96, 97.

Missions in the Church, home and foreign, 120-122.

Muhlenberg, William A., 99; sketch of his career, 103-107.

ONDERDONK, H. U., Bishop, mention of, 128; election to the Episcopate, 131; reminiscences of Bishop White, 136-138.

PARTY spirit in the Church, rise of, 126.

Peters, Rev. Dr., rector of Christ Church, 18.

Philadelphia as it was after the Revolution, 69, 70.

Potter, Alonzo, Bishop, reminiscences of Bishop White, 138-146.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, organized by Bishop Carroll at the same time, 66-68.

SEABURY, Samuel, Bishop, efforts to obtain consecration, 45; relations to Bishop White, 57-60; his part in the General Convention, 60; contrasted with Bishop White, 49-51; large confirmation class, 88; bishop of all New England, 98.

Smith, Dr. William, his work in Maryland, 35; author of the Institution Office, 137.

Sprague, Dr. W. B., reminiscences of Bishop White, 135, 136.

Stone, Dr. John S., reminiscences of Bishop White, 152.

UNITARIANS in New England, why not Churchmen, 116, 117; why none in Connecticut, 126-129; reason of the defection of King's Chapel to, 160; capture of Massachusetts by, 167.

WASHINGTON, George, President, his intimate relations with Bishop White, 70-75.

White, origin of the family, 11.

White, Thomas, comes to America, 12; his son's estimate of him, 13.

White, William, mother of, and family origin, 13; son's opinion of, 14; early education of, 15; playing preacher, 16; at College of Philadelphia, 17; studies for orders, 20; in England to be ordained, 21; English relatives, 22; meets Dr. Johnson and Dr. Goldsmith, 23; in holy orders, 25; assistant minister, 26; marriage, 27; first residence, 28; his position in the Revolution, 28-30; chaplain of Continental Congress, 30, 31; political position, 36; made Doctor of Divinity, 36; "Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered," 37-40; treatment by Connecticut Churchmen, 46; contrast between him and Bishop Seabury, 46; aim to organize the Church properly, 51; sagacity of in obtaining consent of American Government to the Episcopate, 52; elected Bishop, 53; his work as a leader so far, 54-56; trip to England for consecration, 57; part in first Episcopal Consecration, 61; Presiding Bishop, 62; his work contrasted with that of Bishop Carroll, 66-68; relations with General Washington, 70-75; personal portrait of the man, 77-87; confirms his wife and children, 87; other confirmations, 88; cost of his consecration in England, 92; position as a Churchman, 127; address to Convention before electing an Assistant Bishop, 128-130; insulted in his Conven-

tion, 132; reminiscences, 135-152; dislike to be honoured, 152; his study and library habits, 153-155; his various writings, 155-162; method with candidates for orders, 162; public feeling toward him in Philadelphia, 164; bishops consecrated by him, in 1832, 166; his last days, 168; details of his ill-

ness, 169-174; funeral, 175; value of his "Case of Episcopal Churches Considered," 183; his difficulties, 184-186; how his influence was felt, 186; compared with Hobart and Griswold, 187-189; representative Churchman, 189-192; reinterment of his remains, 193.





MAKERS OF AMERICA.

The following is a list of the subjects and authors so far arranged for in this series. The volumes will be published at the uniform price of \$1.00, and will appear in rapid succession : —

Christopher Columbus (1436-1506), and the Discovery of the New World. By CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, President of Cornell University.

John Winthrop (1588-1649), First Governor of the Massachusetts Colony. By Rev. JOSEPH H. TWICHELL.

Robert Morris (1734-1806), Superintendent of Finance under the Continental Congress. By Prof. WILLIAM G. SUMNER, of Yale University.

James Edward Oglethorpe (1689-1785), and the Founding of the Georgia Colony. By HENRY BRUCE, Esq.

John Hughes, D.D. (1797-1864), First Archbishop of New-York : a Representative American Catholic. By HENRY A. BRANN, D.D.

Robert Fulton (1765-1815): His Life and its Results. By Prof. R. H. THURSTON, of Cornell University.

Francis Higginson (1587-1630), Puritan, Author of "New England's Plantation," etc. By THOMAS W. HIGGINSON.

Peter Stuyvesant (1602-1682), and the Dutch Settlement of New-York. By BAYARD TUCKERMAN, Esq., author of a "Life of General Lafayette," editor of the "Diary of Philip Hone," etc., etc.

Thomas Hooker (1586-1647), Theologian, Founder of the Hartford Colony. By GEORGE L. WALKER, D.D.

Charles Sumner (1811-1874), Statesman. By ANNA L. DAWES.

Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826), Third President of the United States. By JAMES SCHOULER, Esq., author of "A History of the United States under the Constitution."

William White (1748-1836), Chaplain of the Continental Congress, Bishop of Pennsylvania, President of the Convention to organize the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. By Rev. JULIUS H. WARD, with an Introduction by Right Rev. Henry C. Potter, D.D., Bishop of New-York.

Jean Baptiste Lemoine, *sieur* de Bienville (1680-1768), French Governor of Louisiana, Founder of New Orleans. By GRACE KING, author of "Monsieur Motte."

Alexander Hamilton (1757-1804), Statesman, Financier, Secretary of the Treasury. By Prof. WILLIAM G. SUMNER, of Yale University.

Cotton Mather (1663-1728), Theologian, Author, Believer in Witchcraft and the Supernatural. By Prof. BARRETT WENDELL, of Harvard University.

Robert Cavelier, *sieur de La Salle* (1643-1687), Explorer of the Northwest and the Mississippi. By EDWARD G. MASON, Esq., President of the Historical Society of Chicago, author of "Illinois" in the Commonwealth Series.

Thomas Nelson (1738-1789), Governor of Virginia, General in the Revolutionary Army. Embracing a Picture of Virginian Colonial Life. By THOMAS NELSON PAGE, author of "Mars Chan," and other popular stories.

George and Cecilius Calvert, Barons Baltimore of Baltimore (1605-1676), and the Founding of the Maryland Colony. By WILLIAM HAND BROWNE, editor of "The Archives of Maryland."

Sir William Johnson (1715-1774), and The Six Nations. By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D., author of "The Mikado's Empire," etc., etc.

Sam. Houston (1793-1862), and the Annexation of Texas. By HENRY BRUCE, Esq.

Joseph Henry, LL.D. (1797-1878), Savant and Natural Philosopher. By FREDERIC H BETTS, Esq.

Ralph Waldo Emerson. By Prof. HERMAN GRIMM, author of "The Life of Michael Angelo," "The Life and Times of Goethe," etc.

DODD, MEAD, & COMPANY,

753 and 755 Broadway, New York.



AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS

[illegible]

YB 33812

101850

BX5995

W5W3

